Calendar No. 179

102D CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
102-116

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1992

JULY 23 (legislative day JULY 8), 1991.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2698]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2698) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith an explanation of the contents of the bill.

TOTAL OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1992

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$52,570,051,000
Amount of change by Senate Committee	549,979,000
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	53,120,030,000
Amount of 1991 appropriations acts to date	54,089,588,000
Amount of estimates, 1992	52,579,946,000
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the appropriations provided in 1991	969,558,000
Over the estimates for 1992	540,084,000
Over the House bill	549,979,000

45-279 ±±

S183-10

BREAKDOWN BY TITLE

The amounts of obligational authority for each of the six titles are shown in the following table. A detailed tabulation, showing comparisons, appears at the end of this report. Recommendations for individual appropriation items, projects and activities are carried in this report under the appropriate item headings.

	1991	1992 Committee recommendation
Title I: Agricultural programs	$8,551,840,000	$12,003,205,000
Title II: Conservation	2,327,704,000	2,791,019,000
Title III: Farmers home and rural development	12,144,641,000	2,715,692,000
Title IV: Domestic food	29,116,620,000	32,954,353,000
Title V: Foreign assistance and related programs	1,124,342,000	1,757,862,000
Title VI: Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration	824,441,000	897,899,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority		53,120,030,000

COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 308 OF THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT

Section 308(a) of the Budget Control Act (Public Law 93–344) requires that this Committee include in its report specific budgetary information on the status of recommended appropriations relative to the First Concurrent Resolution. The following table provides these data:

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93–344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1992: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies:				
Defense				
International	1,486	1,486	1,296	[1] 1,295
Domestic	10,580	10,580	9,618	[1] 9,618
Mandatory	37,888	40,849	29,486	[1] 29,450
Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
1992				[2] 36,476
1993				6,817
1994				547
1995				324
1996 and future years				285
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1992 in bill	NA	13,156	NA	10,835

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Page

Overview and summary of the bill 5

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

Office of the Secretary 6
Office of the Deputy Secretary 6
Office of Budget and Program Analysis 7
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration 7
Rental payments, USDA 8
Building operations and maintenance 8
Advisory committees, USDA 9
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations 13
Office of Public Affairs 13
Office of the Inspector General 14
Office of the General Counsel 15
Office of Assistant Secretary for Economics 15
Economic Research Service 16
National Agricultural Statistics Service 17
World Agricultural Outlook Board 18
Office of Assistant Secretary for Science and Education 18
Agricultural Research Service 19
Cooperative State Research Service 28
Extension Service 40
National Agricultural Library 44
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services 45
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service 45
Food Safety and Inspection Service 51
Federal Grain Inspection Service 52
Agricultural Cooperative Service 53
Agricultural Marketing Service 54
Packers and Stockyards Administration 58

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION

Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs 59
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service 59
Dairy Indemnity Program 61

CORPORATIONS

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation 61
Commodity Credit Corporation 63
General Sales Manager 67

TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment 68
Soil Conservation Service 68
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service 74

Page

TITLE III—FARMERS HOME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development... 80
Farmers Home Administration 80
Self-help Housing Land Development Fund 86
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund 87
Rural Development Insurance Fund 92
Rural Grant Programs 96
Rural Development Administration 104
Rural Electrification Administration 105
Rural Telephone Bank 108

TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services 112
Food and Nutrition Service 112
Human Nutrition Information Service 127

TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Foreign Agricultural Service 128
Public Law 480 130
Office of International Cooperation and Development 134
Scientific activities overseas (Special Foreign Currency Program) 135

TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES

Food and Drug Administration 136
Commodity Futures Trading Commission 139
Farm Credit Administration 140
Farm Credit System Assistant Board 141

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

General provisions 143
Compliance with paragraph 7, rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate 145
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule XXVI of the standing rules of the Senate 145

OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bill provides funding for a wide array of Federal programs, mostly in the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA]. These programs include agricultural research and extension activities, a variety of conservation programs, farm income and commodity price support programs, a number of marketing and inspection activities, several domestic food programs, and the various export and international activities of USDA. The rural development title of the bill includes funding levels for Farmers Home Administration and Rural Electrification Administration programs.

The bill also provides funding for the Food and Drug Administration and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and establishes a limitation on the administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farm Credit System Assistance Board. The bill also provides money to the Department of the Treasury for payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation.

Given the budgetary constraints that the Committee faces, the bill as reported provides the proper amount of emphasis on agricultural and rural development programs. It is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation.

The nutrition and health programs are funded to the full extent necessary to meet current estimates of participation and need. Significant increases over the 1991 level are included for food stamps, child nutrition programs, the feeding program for women, infants, and children [WIC], and the Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico Program.

The Committee has also provided a Public Law 480 program level that is increased over the 1991 level.

All accounts in the bill have been closely examined to ensure that an appropriate level of funding is provided to carry out the programs of USDA, FDA, CFTC, and Farm Credit System agencies. Details on each of the accounts, the funding level, and the Committee's justifications behind the funding levels are included in the report.

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $1,943,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,282,000
House allowance	2,282,000
Committee recommendation	2,150,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $25 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Secretary of Agriculture, assisted by the Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, and members of their immediate staffs, directs and coordinates the work of the Department. This includes developing policy, maintaining relationships with agricultural organizations and others in the development of farm programs, and maintaining liaison with the Executive Office of the President and Members of Congress on all matters pertaining to agricultural policy.

The general authority of the Secretary to supervise and control the work of the Department is contained in the Organic Act (7 U.S.C. 2201-2202). The delegation of regulatory functions to Department employees and authorization of appropriations to carry out these functions is contained in 7 United States Code 450c-450g.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Secretary, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,150,000. This amount is $207,000 more than the 1991 appropriation and $132,000 less than both the budget request and the House level. The Committee continues the practice of appropriating funds for the Under and Assistant Secretaries in separate accounts.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $477,000
Budget estimate, 1992	543,000
House allowance	543,000
Committee recommendation	514,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $6 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Deputy Secretary, the Committee recommends $514,000. This amount is $29,000 less than both the budget request and the House level, and $37,000 more than the 1991 level.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $4,971,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,549,000
House allowance	6,149,000
Committee recommendation	5,303,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $65 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of Budget and Program Analysis provides direction and administration of the Department's budgetary functions including development, presentation and execution of the budget; reviews program and legislative proposals for program, budget, and related implications; analyzes program and resource issues and alternatives and prepares summaries of pertinent data to aid the Secretary and departmental policy officials and agency program managers in the descisionmaking process; and provides Departmentwide coordination for and participation in the presentation of budget related matters to the committees of the Congress, the press, and interested public. The Office also provides Departmentwide coordination of the preparation and processing of legislative programs and reports.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, the Committee recommends $5,303,000. This amount is $246,000 less than the budget request, $846,000 less than the House level, and $332,000 more than the 1991 level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $544,000
Budget estimate, 1992	658,000
House allowance	596,000
Committee recommendation	576,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $7 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration directs and coordinates the work of the departmental staff in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress relating to accounting functions, real and personal property management, automated data processing, personnel management, development and dissemination of departmental information resources management, and other general administrative functions. In addition, the Office of the Assistant Secretary is responsible for all activities financed under the Department Working Capital Fund (7 U.S.C. 2235).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $576,000, $32,000 more than the amount for 1991, $20,000 less than the House level, and $82,000 less than the budget request.

RENTAL PAYMENTS, USDA

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $49,305,000
Budget estimate, 1992	51,598,000
House allowance	50,808,000
Committee recommendation	51,598,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $635 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

This appropriation was established by the Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1983 (Public Law 97-370) to finance the appropriated portion of the payments to the General Services Administration [GSA] for rental of leased space and related services to all USDA agencies except the Forest Service which is funded in another appropriation bill.

Agency budget estimates for rent are based on GSA's projection of what it will charge the agency in a given budget year. GSA sets rates according to the market value of property or space occupied, and independent of any agency input. Rent receipts are placed in a fund used by GSA in the management of its real property operations. All Federal Government agencies utilizing Government-owned or leased property pay into this fund, which provides GSA with a pool of capital to support overall Government space needs. In effect, agencies are paying prevailing commercial rental rates in order to subsidize the inflated cost of new construction and newly leased space, and to provide for vacant space in GSA's inventory.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For USDA rental payments, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $51,598,000, $2,293,000 more than the amount provided in 1991, the same as the budget request, and $790,000 more than the House level.

BUILDING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $25,093,000
Budget estimate, 1992	25,700,000
House allowance	25,700,000
Committee recommendation	25,349,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $326 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

On October 1, 1984, the General Services Administration [GSA] delegated the operations and maintenance function for the buildings in the D.C. complex to the Department. This activity provides departmental staff and support services to operate, maintain, and repair the five buildings in the D.C. complex. GSA expanded the delegation to include two additional buildings on October 1, 1986. One building is the Government-owned warehouse for forms in Lanham, MD, and the other is a leased warehouse for the excess property operation located at 49 L Street, SW, Washington, DC. GSA retains responsibility for major nonrecurring repairs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For building operations and maintenance, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $25,349,000. This amount is $256,000 more than the 1991 level and $351,000 less than both the House level and the budget request.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $1,407,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,038,000
House allowance	1,918,000
Committee recommendation	2,038,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $18 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The Department of Agriculture and several of its agencies utilize advisory committees to provide supplemental and specialized expertise. These advisory committees are comprised of experts and professionals from the academic and private sectors. The Assistant Secretary for Administration is the principal Department officer responsible for performing functions and coordinating activities of these committees.

The following table displays advisory committees that are proposed for fiscal year 1992:

ADVISORY COMMITTEES (EXCLUDING FOREST SERVICE)

Policy area and committee title	1992 estimated	
	Membership	Funds
Food and consumer services:		
National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant, and Fetal Nutrition	20	$40,250
National Advisory Council on Commodity Distribution	17	78,235
National Nutrition Monitoring Advisory Council	9	65,000
Advisory Committee on Welfare Simplification and Coordination	15	82,400
Total	61	265,885
Science and education:		
National Agricultural Research and Extension Users Advisory Board	32	201,975
National Arboretum Advisory Council	23	11,386
Human Nutrition Board of Scientific Counselors	13	15,769
National Plant Genetic Resources Board/Advisory Council for National Genetic Resources Program	16	32,100
Science and Education National Research Initiative Advisory Committee	19	17,679
Animal Health Science Research Advisory Board	12	19,408
Cooperative Forestry Research Advisory Council	22	29,430
Committee of Nine	12	35,334
Agricultural Biotechnology Research Advisory Committee	22	121,036
Joint Council on Food and Agriculture Sciences	37	346,000
Agricultural Science and Technology Review Board	11	65,000
Advisory Council on National Sustainable Agriculture	16	52,100
Global Climate Change Technical Advisory Committee	10	19,100
Total	245	966,317
Marketing and inspection services:		
Federal Grain Inspection Service Advisory Committee	24	55,744
National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection	17	23,057
National Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods	34	45,607
Advisory Committees on:		
Foreign Animal and Poultry Diseases	22	25,344
Swine Health Protection	10	.....
National Committee on Cotton Marketing	18	27,719
General Conference Committee of the National Poultry Improvement Plan	13	14,186
National Animal Damage Control Advisory Committee	23	19,352
Scrappie Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee	13	42,510
National Organic Standards Board	15	120,000
Total	189	373,519

ADVISORY COMMITTEES (EXCLUDING FOREST SERVICE)—Continued

Policy area and committee title	1992 estimated	
	Membership	Funds
International affairs and commodity programs:		
Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for Trade	29	15,538
Technical Advisory Committees for Trade in:		
Cotton	11	14,465
Fruits and vegetables	19	14,465
Grain and feed	14	15,538
Livestock and livestock products	10	15,538
Oilseeds and Oilseed products	13	14,465
Poultry and eggs	9	14,465
Tobacco	7	14,465
Dairy products	13	14,465
Sweetners	8	14,465
Processed food	8	14,465
Agribusiness Promotion Council		22,278
Agriculture Committee for Providing Advise to Emerging Democracies	25	14,900
Total	166	199,512
Small community and rural development:		
President's Council on Rural Development	20	80,754
Federal Crop Insurance Advisory Committee	25	10,000
Total	45	90,754
Conservation: Soil Conservation Service Advisory Committee	20	43,400
Economics: National Agricultural Cost of Production Standards Review Board	11	31,042
Departmental administration: Citizen's Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity	31	67,571
Total, advisory committees	768	2,038,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For advisory committees for the Department of Agriculture, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,038,000 the same as the budget request, $631,000 more than the 1991 level, and $120,000 more than the House amount.

The recommendation includes $120,000, as requested in the budget, for the National Organic Standards Board. The House did not fund this board. Under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990, the Secretary is required to establish national minimum organic standards for producers and handlers of agricultural products. The National Organic Standards Board is to provide recommendations on implementation of the act, as well as to develop a national list of approved and prohibited substances.

The Committee expects that the Department will utilize such funds as may be required from the Agricultural Marketing Service and other agencies of the Department, as appropriate, in working with the National Organic Standards Board to carry out the provisions of this act.

The Committee notes that in 1991 the Department funded the President's Council on Rural Development. No appropriation was provided for this council. In addition, funds were provided to various advisory committees in excess of the amounts provided by Congress. The Committee expects the Department to use the funds for which appropriated and to notify the House and Senate Commit-

tees on Appropriations in advance of any changes. Furthermore, the Department's explanatory notes on the budget should explain new advisory committees and justify the amounts provided. The Committee notes the transfer of funding for the Joint Council on Food and Agriculture Sciences from the Cooperative State Research Service proposed in the budget with no explanation.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $24,757,000
Budget estimate, 1992	29,943,000
House allowance	27,943,000
Committee recommendation	24,757,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $322 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Department has the responsibility to meet the same standards regarding the storage and disposition of hazardous waste as private businesses. The Department is required to contain, cleanup, monitor, and inspect for hazardous waste in areas covered by the Department or within departmental jurisdiction.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $24,757,000 for hazardous waste management. This amount is the same as the 1991 level, $5,186,000 less than the budget request, and $3,186,000 less than the House amount. Bill language is recommended making these funds available September 20, 1992.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $23,052,000
Budget estimate, 1992	26,563,000
House allowance	25,064,000
Committee recommendation	24,814,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $300 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The departmental staff offices provide staff support to the top policy officials of the Department and overall direction and coordination of the work of USDA's program agencies to ensure the efficient and effective management and operation of the Department.

Activities carried out by the departmental staff offices include:

Overall direction and administration of the Department's budgetary functions including development, presentation, execution control, reporting, and adjustment of funds and manpower resources; evaluation of program and legislative proposals for program, budget, and related resource implications; and analysis of program and resource issues and alternatives, and preparation of summaries of pertinent data to aid departmental policy officials and agency program managers in the decisionmaking process;

Departmental leadership, oversight, and policy development in the areas of real and personal property, procurement, contracts, financial affairs, management improvement, and automated data processing;

Guidance in and support of the personnel management program of the Department;

—Overall leadership and coordination for the Department's programs for equal opportunity and civil rights; implementation and administration of programs under sections 8 and 15 of the Small Business Act; and direction of the Department's efforts to further the participation of minority colleges and universities in departmental programs; direction and monitoring of compliance in promoting full and open competition in procurement;

—Departmental leadership, development, and evaluation of programs in finance, accounting, Federal assistance, occupational safety and health, travel, productivity improvement, management improvement; and provision of budget, accounting, and fiscal services to the Office of the Secretary and Departmental staff offices;

—Administration of regulatory hearings and decisions by the administrative law judges who hold rulemaking and adjudicatory hearings and issue initial decisions and orders, and by the judicial officer who serves as final deciding officer in regulatory proceedings;

—Development and dissemination of departmental information resources management [IRM] standards, guidelines, rules, and regulations necessary to implement approved IRM principles, policies, and programs that improve the operational effectiveness of USDA's programs; provision of telecommunications and automated data processing [ADP] services to USDA agencies and staff offices;

—Development of policies and procedures to minimize and control burdens associated with collection of information by the Department from individuals, businesses, and other private institutions, and State and local governments;

—Development of policies and procedures to provide required long-range IRM planning for the Department and to guide the planning of its agencies; and

—Development of policies and procedures for the required review, monitoring, and oversight of major agency and departmental information resources management programs.

—Development of policies and procedures for USDA's proportional share of the communications system being developed as part of the National Security and Emergency Preparedness Program. Participation in the NCS is required under National Security Directive 201 of December 1985.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For departmental administration, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $24,814,000. This amount is $1,762,000 more than the amount provided in 1991, $1,749,000 less than the budget estimate, and $250,000 less than the House level.

The Committee recommendation does not include requested program increases other than for the Federal Pay Reform Act.

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $1,095,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,310,000
House allowance	1,307,000
Committee recommendation	1,265,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $14 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations maintains liaison with the Congress and White House on legislative matters.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,265,000. This amount is $170,000 more than the amount available in 1991, $45,000 less than the budget estimate, and $42,000 less than the House level.

Office of Public Affairs

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $8,442,000
Budget estimate, 1992	9,093,000
House allowance	8,925,000
Committee recommendation	8,925,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $110 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Public Affairs Office provides direction, leadership, and balance in the development and delivery of useful information through all media to the public on USDA's research, educational, and regulatory activities. It also serves as the focal point for liaison between the Department and the public, including the many associations and companies representing America's food and fiber system, with emphasis on policy education.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Public Affairs Office, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,925,000. This amount is $483,000 more than the amount provided in 1991, the same as the House level, and $168,000 less than the budget request.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $440,000
Budget estimate, 1992	506,000
House allowance	468,000
Committee recommendation	468,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $5 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Intergovernmental Affairs Office directs and coordinates all programs involving the implementation of USDA policies and procedures applicable to the Department's intra and intergovernmental affairs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Intergovernmental Affairs Office, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $468,000 which is $38,000 less than the budget request, the same as the House level, and $28,000 more than the 1991 amount.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $55,580,000
Budget estimate, 1992	65,247,000
House allowance	62,786,000
Committee recommendation	60,786,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $723 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Inspector General [OIG] was established by law October 12, 1978, by the Inspector General Act of 1978. This act expanded and provided specific authorities for the activities of the Office of the Inspector General which had previously been carried out under the general authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The inspector general:

—Provides policy direction and conducts, supervises, and coordinates all audits and investigations;

—Reviews existing and proposed legislation and regulations and makes recommendations to the Secretary and Congress regarding the impact such initiatives will have on the economy and efficiency of the Department's programs and operations, and the prevention and detection of fraud and abuse in such programs;

—Recommends policies for and conducts, supervises, or coordinates other activities in the Department whose purposes are to promote economy and efficiency or prevent and detect fraud and abuse;

—Recommends policies for and conducts, supervises, or coordinates relationships between the Department and other Federal, State, and local government agencies concerning: (a) promoting economy and efficiency; (b) preventing and detecting fraud and abuse; and (c) identifying and prosecuting people involved in fraud or abuse; and

—Keeps the Secretary and the Congress fully and currently informed about fraud, other serious problems, abuses, and deficiencies in Department programs and operations, recommends corrective action, and reports on the progress made in correcting the problem.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Inspector General, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $60,786,000. This amount is $5,206,000 more than the amount available in 1991, $4,461,000 less than the budget request, and $2,000,000 less than the House level.

The Committee does not include $2,000,000 for food stamp activities as proposed by the House, and notes that funding for this purpose is included under the Food and Nutrition Service.

The Committee recognizes that developing and maintaining a modern, coordinated financial management system is essential to

the financial stability of the Federal Government. Many financial management systems in the Government are obsolete and inefficient, providing information that is often unreliable, inconsistent, and incomplete. The Chief Financial Officers [CFO] Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-576) is intended to remedy this situation by establishing centrally coordinated systems of accounting, financial management, and internal controls, and by improving financial reporting practices. Funds under this account may be used for activities under the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990.

Office of the General Counsel

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $23,130,000
Budget estimate, 1992	25,865,000
House allowance	24,554,000
Committee recommendation	24,554,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $301 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of General Counsel was established in 1910, and the General Counsel, as chief law officer of the Department, is responsible for providing legal services for all programs, operations, and activities of the Department. The General Counsel is assisted by a Deputy General Counsel and four Associate General Counsels, each of whom is responsible for a portion of the legal work of the Department. The functions of this office are performed in the Washington office and in 22 field offices.

The field offices handle legal work relating to the activities of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farmers Home Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and the Food and Nutrition Service. By delegation of the General Counsel, legal work relating to other programs and activities of the Department may be handled by a field office.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the General Counsel, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $24,554,000. This amount is $1,424,000 more than the amount provided in 1991, $1,311,000 less than the budget request, and the same as the House level.

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $529,000
Budget estimate, 1992	580,000
House allowance	580,000
Committee recommendation	563,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $7 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress in the area of economics, statistics, and other social sciences research, analysis, and information related to food, agriculture, and rural resources. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the National Agricultural Statistics Service, Economic Research Service, World Agricultural Outlook Board, economic analysis staff, economic management staff, and the Office of Energy.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $563,000 which is $34,000 more than the 1991 amount and $17,000 less than both the budget request and the House level.

Economic Research Service

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $54,400,000
Budget estimate, 1992	62,479,000
House allowance	59,125,000
Committee recommendation	56,245,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $707 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Economic Research Service [ERS], originally established in 1961 principally under the authority of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621—1627), was reestablished under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture as a USDA bureau in 1981.

ERS produces economic and other social science information as a service to the general public and to aid Congress and the executive branch in developing, administering, and evaluating agricultural and rural policies and programs. ERS monitors, analyzes, and forecasts United States and world agricultural production and demand for production resources, agricultural commodities, and food and fiber products. ERS also measures the costs of and returns to agricultural production and marketing; evaluates the economic performance of U.S. agricultural production and marketing; and estimates the effects of Government policies and programs on farmers, rural residents and communities, natural resources, and Americans in general. In addition, ERS produces economic and other social science information about the organization and institutions of the United States and world agricultural production and marketing systems, natural resources, and rural communities.

ERS-produced information is made widely available to the general public through research monographs, situation and outlook reports, professional and trade journals (including ERS's journal, Agricultural Economics Research), magazines (including ERS's magazines, Agricultural Outlook, Farmline, National Food Review, and Rural Development Perspectives), radio, television, newspapers, direct computer access, and frequent participation of ERS staff at various public forums.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Economic Research Service, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $56,245,000. This amount is $1,845,000 more than the 1991 amount, $6,234,000 less than the budget request, and $2,880,000 less than the House level.

Up to $395,000 is included to expand the capability of providing more differentiated commodity/product modeling on rice. This effort will be conducted in coordination with the University of Arkansas and the University of Missouri and will expand the capability of the commodity policy modeling system to conduct analysis on the consequences of value-added exports.

Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee recommendation does not include any portion of the $3,650,000 requested for the pesticide data program.

The Western Livestock Marketing Information Program, established in 1955, is an extremely effective service involving 15 States in the Great Plains and western regions of the United States. Since 1979, this program has been supported by the Economic Research Service in the form of a $50,000 annual contribution. The Committee urges ERS to continue to provide financial support to the program and, in view of inflation over the past decade, encourages ERS to increase its support for the program to $100,000 annually.

National Agricultural Statistics Service

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $76,451,000
Budget estimate, 1992	86,866,000
House allowance	83,401,000
Committee recommendation	75,447,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $994 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The primary responsibilities of the National Agricultural Statistics Service [NASS] (formerly known as the Statistical Reporting Service) are the development and issuance of national and State agricultural statistics, statistical research, and coordination of the Department's statistical programs as authorized under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627).

NASS programs are conducted in the following major areas:

Crop and livestock estimates.—This area includes estimates of production, supply, price, and other aspects of the agricultural economy; conduct of enumerative and objective measurement surveys; preparation and issuance of the official national and State estimates and reports of the Department relating to acreages, types and production of farm crops, number of livestock on farms, livestock products, stocks of agricultural commodities, value and utilization of farm products, prices received and paid by farmers, and other subjects as required.

Statistical research and service.—This area includes the research on and development of improved statistical techniques used in gathering and evaluating statistical data, including use of satellite data.

Work performed for others.—Services are performed for other Federal and State agencies and private commodity organizations on a reimbursable or advance payment basis. These services consist primarily of conducting surveys and performing related statistical data collection activities. They also include technical consultation and support and technical assistance programs abroad under participating agency service agreements.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $75,447,000. This amount is $1,004,000 less than the amount provided in 1991, $11,419,000 less than the budget estimate, and $7,954,000 less than the House level.

The Committee concurs with the House in providing $60,000 to conduct a survey of the nursery industry which will assist in deter-

mining the future direction of this industry. The recommendation includes neither $6,000,000 requested in the budget for the pesticide data program nor other requested program increases.

The Committee expects the Department to maintain compilation for and production of all reports and publications that were issued in 1991, including maintaining the State of New Mexico on its list to receive a monthly survey under the farm labor wage rate activity. Since funds were not provided, the Committee does not concur with the House in expecting reinstatement of the hired farm working force report which had previously been done by the Economic Research Service.

The Committee does not concur with the House increase of $415,000 for the report of cotton ginned.

World Agricultural Outlook Board

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $2,196,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,520,000
House allowance	2,367,000
Committee recommendation	2,341,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $29 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The World Agricultural Outlook Board [WAOB] serves as the single focal point for the Nation's economic intelligence related to domestic and international food and agriculture with the responsibility for coordinating and reviewing for clearance all commodity and aggregate agricultural and food-related data used to develop outlook and situation material within the Department of Agriculture. The Board's primary objective is to improve the consistency, objectivity, and reliability of outlook and situation material developed in the Department.

The Board's functions include information dissemination; market surveillance; coordination of international and domestic agricultural developments; and coordination of weather, climate and remote sensing research and forecasting techniques.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the World Agricultural Outlook Board, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,341,000. This amount is $145,000 more than the amount provided in 1991, $179,000 less than the budget estimate, and $26,000 less than the House allowance.

Office of Assistant Secretary for Science and Education

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $512,000
Budget estimate, 1992	560,000
House allowance	560,000
Committee recommendation	544,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $7 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress for food and agricultural research, extension, and teaching efforts. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Agricultural Research Service, the Extension Service, the Cooperative State Research Service, and the National Agricultural Library.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $544,000. This amount is $32,000 more than the fiscal year 1991 amount and $16,000 less than both the budget request and the House level.

The Committee encourages the development of international agricultural research, extension, higher education, and information programs. The Committee supports international programs which bring trade opportunities, new technologies and genetic resources, and other benefits of international agricultural research to U.S. farmers to enhance their competitiveness. The Department is encouraged to work further with U.S. State universities and land-grant colleges to develop programs which carry out these objectives and which prepare agriculture graduates to compete in the global marketplace.

The Committee concurs with the House in expecting the Department to pursue research and extension efforts to assess the role of composting as an education and recycling technique for farm wastes and for other waste streams, as appropriate, and to identify agricultural uses and markets for finished compost.

ALTERNATIVE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND COMMERCIALIZATION

Appropriations, 1991	.....
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	$5,000,000

The Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Act of 1990, subtitle G of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 was established to develop and produce marketable products other than food, feed, or traditional forest or fiber products. It will assist in researching, developing, commercializing, and marketing new nonfood, nonfeed uses for traditional and new agricultural commodities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

To fund the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Act [AARC] of 1990, the Committee recommends $5,000,000. There was no budget request and the House provided no funding for this newly authorized program.

The Committee notes considerable support for redirected research efforts toward the commercialization of nonfood, nonfeed uses of traditional and new agricultural commodities. With this funding, the Committee expects the development of new and exciting uses of the Nation's bountiful agricultural commodities.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $624,085,000
Budget estimate, 1992	663,127,000
House allowance	660,924,000
Committee recommendation	631,643,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $8,113 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The Agricultural Research Service [ARS] is responsible for conducting basic, applied, and developmental research on: soil and water conservation; plant productivity; animal productivity; commodity conversion and delivery; human nutrition; and integration of agricultural systems.

The research applies to a wide range of goals, commodities, natural resources, fields of science, and geographic, climatic, and environmental conditions.

As the U.S. Department of Agriculture's in-house agricultural research unit, ARS has major responsibilities for conducting and leading the national agricultural research effort. It provides initiative and leadership in five areas: research on broad regional and national problems; research to support Federal action and regulatory agencies; expertise to meet national emergencies; research support for international programs; and scientific resource to the executive branch and Congress.

The mission of ARS research is to develop new knowledge and technology which will ensure an abundance of high quality agricultural commodities and products at reasonable prices to meet the increasing needs of an expanding economy and to provide for the continued improvement in the standard of living of all Americans. This mission focuses on the development of technical information and technical products which bear directly on the need to (1) manage and use the Nation's soil, water, air, and climatic resources, and improve the Nation's environment; (2) provide an adequate supply of agricultural products by observing practices that will maintain a permanent and effective agriculture; (3) improve the nutrition and well-being of the American people; (4) improve living in rural America; and (5) strengthen the Nation's balance of payments.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Salaries and expenses.—For salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Research Service, the Committee recommends $631,643,000, $7,558,000 above the 1991 level, $31,484,000 less than the budget request, and $29,281,000 less than the House level.

The amount provided by the Committee includes $2,500,000 for the special fund. These funds are used to strengthen work at Federal research installations in the field by employing junior scientific help under contracts and cooperative agreements.

The following table shows increases to the level available for 1991 recommended in the budget, by the House, and by the Senate for general programs, locations, or projects.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget increases	House increases	Senate increases
Fiscal year 1991 base	621,585	621,585	621,585
Budget increases (program):			
Aflatoxin (included in food safety)	(1,500)	(1,500)	.....
Water quality	4,000	2,000	.....
Global climate change	4,000	2,900	.....
Gypsum	2,000	2,000	.....
Integrated pest management	1,500	750	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget increases	House increases	Senate increases
Animal waste	1,000	500	.....
Alternative fuels	2,000	2,000	.....
Minor use pesticide	1,000	1,000	.....
Food safety	6,000	2,000	.....
Chemical residue in foods	1,500	750	.....
Pay costs	16,042	18,042	16,042
Total	€60,627	653,527	637,627
Committee additions:			
Acoustics research, Mississippi	.....	500	.....
Animal health consortium, Ames, IA	.....	.....	400
Apple research	.....	.....	275
Arkansas staff	.....	.....	400
Barley	.....	.....	100
Beckley, WV, conservation lab	.....	.....	300
Bee research	.....	500	.....
Biological control, Tifton, GA	.....	.....	100
Boll weevil, Stoneville, MS	.....	.....	150
Columbia Plateau Conservation Research Center, OR	.....	.....	250
Corn earworm	.....	150	.....
Dry bean, WA	.....	.....	125
Endophyte, Arkansas, Missouri	.....	.....	200
Floriculture	.....	125	.....
Forage and Range Research Unit, Mandan, ND	.....	.....	250
Human nutrition:	.....		
Baylor, TX	.....	500	.....
Beltsville, MD	.....	500	250
Grand Forks, ND	.....	.....	250
Kearneysville, WV, fruit lab	.....	.....	300
Kenaf	.....	150	.....
Lyme disease, New York	.....	175	.....
Meat Animal Research Center, Nebraska	.....	.....	400
National arboretum	.....	400	.....
New England Plant, Soil, and Water Laboratory, Orono, ME	.....	.....	300
Northwest Small Fruit Research Center	.....	.....	250
Peanut research	.....	600	300
Purdue University:	.....		
Animal science	.....	500	.....
Plant science	.....	950	.....
Red River Valley Agriculture Research Center, Fargo, ND	.....	.....	150
Repair and maintenance, ARS facilities	.....	.....	(14,986)
Small fruits, Poplarville, MS	.....	.....	150
Southern Plains Range Research Station, Oklahoma	.....	.....	280
Soybean-based ink	.....	122	122
STEEP II	.....	200	200
Urban pests, Gainsville, FL	.....	100	.....
Unspecified decrease	.....	(575)	.....
Warm Water Aquaculture Center, Mississippi	.....	.....	500
Subtotal, committee additions	.....	4,897	(8,484)
Subtotal, Agricultural Research Service	660,627	658,424	629,143
Special fund	2,500	2,500	2,500
Total, Agricultural Research Service, fiscal year 1992	663,127	660,924	631,643

Individual items are discussed below:

***Animal health consortium.*—An increase of $400,000, for a total of $872,000 is provided by the Committee for the Animal Health Consortium at Ames, IA, to continue research on animal immune**

systems. The consortium is affiliated with the ARS biotechnology research development consortia at Peoria, IL.

Apple research.—The Committee recommends an increase of $275,000 for apple research in the area of pesticide use and postharvest technologies. This research will be in coordination with the International Apple Institute.

Aquaculture.—The Committee concurs with the plans to continue, in 1992, the fish-linked-to-plant aquaculture research and development project and the demonstration program that would test the feasibility of establishing aquaculture on family farms in the Appalachian region. The Committee directs that, from within available funds, program and site plans be established for the development of a national center for fresh water aquaculture to research, develop, and apply effective and efficient aquaculture husbandry technology and practices for fresh water fish production.

Arkansas staff.—The Committee expects ARS to give attention to the interest of the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville in acquiring two ARS scientists to assist in the area of environmental/conservation/sustainable research in the delta region and animal waste management/water quality research and to complete in 1992 the location of the food safety/poultry scientists as called for in Senate Report 101-468. An increase of $400,000 is provided to meet those needs.

Barley.—An increase of $100,000 is provided to support existing research and to hire a malting quality evaluation researcher at the ARS Cereal Crops Research Unit located at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Beckley, WV, conservation laboratory.—For a program to develop methods to use byproducts from coal-powered electric plants as a substitute for lime at the Appalachian Soil and Water Conservation Laboratory in Beckley, WV, the Committee recommends an increase of $300,000.

Biological control.—An increase of $100,000 is provided by the Committee for biological control of insects research at Tifton, GA.

Boll weevil.—The Committee provides an increase of $150,000 for the Boll Weevil Research Unit at Mississippi State for expansion of ecology studies to transfer control method technology to practical uses.

Center for Food Safety and Postharvest Technology.—The Committee concurs with the budget request and the House in providing $372,000 to continue the cooperative agreement with the Mississippi Center for Food Safety and Postharvest Technology.

Columbia Plateau Conservation Research Center.—An increase of $250,000 is provided to the Columbia Plateau Agricultural Research Center in Pendleton, OR, to maintain two positions—one in microbiology and one in soil-water physics.

Cotton waste conversion to ethanol.—Many tons of cotton waste are produced annually which must be eliminated by expensive incineration or landfill. Recent technological advances have shown that cotton waste conversion to alcohol is cost effective and has no environmental pollution problems. The Committee is aware of proposed research efforts by three Mississippi universities in cooperation with the Tennessee Valley Authority to convert this waste to

ethanol and encourages the Department to review and assist in the activities for this new technology.

Dry bean.—The Committee provides an increase of $125,000 for dry bean research. This increase is for continuation of research on virus and root rot work at Prosser, WA.

Endophyte.—For a center of excellence in endophyte/grass research to be operated cooperatively by the University of Missouri and the University of Arkansas, the Committee recommends $200,000. The purpose of this research is to enhance the sustainability of fescue-based beef production and to develop innovative applications of endophyte in improving stress resistance in other forage, turf, and grain crop species.

Forage and Range Research Unit.—An increase of $250,000 is provided for the Forage and Range Research Unit in Mandan, ND, to continue research on seedstocks enhancement and to expand research for improved development and management of grasses and legumes.

Guayule.—The Committee recommends continuation of guayule research at the 1991 level of $910,000.

Human nutrition.—An increase of $250,000, $250,000 less than the House, for a total of $8,943,000, is provided for the Beltsville Human Nutrition Research Center. The increase is for continuing research on food components and their relationship to human health.

An increase of $250,000 is also recommended for the Grand Forks Human Nutrition Research Center for research on nutritional requirements for zinc, magnesium, boron, copper, iron, and other minor elements and their relationship to optimal health, function, and performance, and the physiological and biochemical factors influencing minor element requirements in all age groups and biological availability of minerals.

Johne's disease.—The Committee recommends continuation of research on Johne's disease at the 1991 level of $723,000.

Kearneysville, WV, fruit laboratory.—The Committee recommends an increase of $300,000 to develop sensor technology to reduce the losses and costs of handling and storing fruit at the Appalachian Fruit Research Laboratory at Kearneysville, WV. The research will build on results that scientists at the station have had in determining biological control agents that can effectively replace chemical pesticides in many postharvest situations.

Meadowfoam.—For continued research on meadowfoam, the Committee recommends $387,000, the same as the 1991 level and the budget request.

Meat Animal Research Center.—For research to study livestock gene mapping at the Meat Animal Research Center, Clay Center, NE, the Committee recommends an increase of $400,000.

National Sedimentation Laboratory.—The Committee concurs with the budget request and House in providing funding for work now underway at the National Sedimentation Laboratory. The laboratory is encouraged to expand its preliminary studies on the use of acoustics to characterize soils, determine moisture content, and monitor crop growth. Further, it is encouraged to continue its close relationship with the National Center for Physical Acoustics in these research efforts and to develop additional applications.

New England Plant, Soil, and Water Laboratory.—An increase of $300,000 is provided to the New England Plant, Soil, and Water Laboratory at the University of Maine, Orono, ME, to hire additional scientists and support personnel to research nematodes and other soil pathogens.

Northwest Small Fruit Research Center.—The Committee has provided an increase of $250,000 to support expanded research activities, program operational support, equipment, and staffing at the Northwest Small Fruits Research Center. This research will help to improve, modernize, and expand berry and grape production, processing, and marketing of high-quality, premium-priced, value-added, and fresh products, and to address problems in pest management.

Oregon.—ARS is directed to continue its commitment to three Oregon research facilities in Burns, Corvallis, and Pendleton. In addition, the Committee is aware of coordinated, multidisciplinary research into the cardiovascular protective effects of dietary calcium being conducted at Oregon Health Sciences University's [OHSU] Institute for Nutrition and Cardiovascular Research. The Committee understands that this research is important in assessing calcium impacts on pregnancy, infant birth weight and a wide variety of other nutritional areas. The Committee expects the Department to work with OHSU to continue this research.

Pea and lentil research.—The Committee recommends continued funding for pea and lentil research at the 1991 level in the Pacific Northwest, which includes a program to control lygus bugs on peas and lentils through the cooperative efforts of the University of Idaho, Washington State University, and the USDA-ARS Insect Laboratory in Yakima, WA.

Peanut research.—For peanut research, the Committee provides an increase of $300,000, $300,000 less than the House, for a total of $6,621,000. The increase is for peanut processing research at the National Peanut Laboratory, Dawson, GA.

The Committee is concerned with ARS proposals to terminate peanut research activities at the Peanut Research Unit in Stillwater, OK. The Committee understands that the Stillwater facility conducts vital plant pathology, plant breeding, and plant physiology research which benefits the entire southwestern U.S. peanut industry. While the Committee agrees with initiatives to maximize scarce research resources, the Committee directs ARS to continue research activities at Stillwater.

Pear thrip.—The recommendation includes $78,000, the same as the 1991 and budget request levels, to continue research on various nonchemical means of controlling pear thrip, including fungi and other biological means. This pest is particularly devastating to maples in New England, and the research should be carried out in that region.

Pima cotton improvement.—Continuation of a viable American Pima program by ARS, including the development of the germplasm base, inheritance studies, developmental breeding, and the development and release of improved varieties is essential if the United States is to maintain its competitive position in domestic and export markets for ELS cotton. Therefore, the Committee urges ARS's continued and expanded support for this project.

Red River Valley Agriculture Research Center.—The Committee recommends an increase of $150,000 for the Red River Valley Agriculture Research Center's Biosciences Laboratory for expanded research on alternative means of insect control, including biocontrol, and metabolism of agricultural chemicals. The Committee is aware of the transfer of a screwworm research project away from this center. It is expected that ARS will provide the necessary funds, in addition to the increase provided here, to cover associated operations and overhead costs at the center as a result of the displacement of the screwworm research project.

Repair and maintenance.—Repair and maintenance of ARS facilities is funded under the "Buildings and facilities" account.

Russian wheat aphid.—A total of $2,317,000 is provided for research on the Russian wheat aphid. This is the same as the 1991 level, the 1992 budget request, and the House level. This work is to be done in conjunction with other USDA agencies. The Committee reiterates its expectation that additional attention will be given to the control of this aphid in the Great Plains States. It is also expected that additional research will be conducted on control of the aphid as it affects barley.

Small farms.—As in the past, the Committee recommends full funding for the Small Farms Research Center at Booneville, AR.

Small fruits, Poplarville, MS.—The Committee recommends an increase of $150,000 to establish a position at the ARS Small Fruits Research Lab in Poplarville to focus and expand research on postharvest problems.

Southern Plains Range Research Station.—The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $280,000 for the Southern Plains Range Research Station, Woodward, OK. The funding will be used for research on gamagrass—a highly productive perennial forage that holds significant potential for the dairy and beef industries throughout the Southern and Eastern United States.

Soybean research.—The Committee provides for the continuation of soybean composition and southern production research as included in the budget and House bill at a level of $525,000. This level is to be divided in a manner which will place emphasis on southern soybean breeding and northern composition.

Soybean-based ink.—The Committee concurs with the House in providing $500,000, an increase of $122,000 above the budget request, for research on soybean-based ink. Of the available amount, not less than $125,000 is available to continue and to expand the research at the National Printing Ink Research Institute at Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA.

Starch and acetate.—The Committee expects ARS to expand starch and acetate research. It is expected that research on nonfood uses of starch from such commodities as corn and potatoes will result in additional and expanded markets for these crops. Through acetate research, corn starch could become the main source for certain acetate products, for which there is a significant market.

STEEP II.—To support the STEEP II research project on soil erosion and water quality at ARS facilities in Pullman, WA, and Pendleton, OR, the Committee concurs with the House in providing an increase of $200,000.

Sugarcane research.—The Committee expects ARS to continue research on sugarcane genetic engineering and on promising sucrose-based byproducts and to continue funding these activities at 1991 levels. In order to reestablish a critical research mass, the Committee also expects ARS to restore the activities of the Sugarcane Physiology Research Unit at the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association Experiment Station to 1986 levels.

Value added/quality research.—U.S. agriculture's continued economic strength depends on efficient production and value-added technology. The Committee urges ARS to continue to place high priority on cotton textile processing research conducted at New Orleans, LA, and Clemson, SC, to (a) improve quality, (b) reduce defects, and (c) improve easy-care products.

Warm water aquaculture center.—The Committee recommends an increase of $500,000 to provide program operational support, equipment, and staffing for the National Center for Warm Water Aquaculture in Mississippi.

Water quality.—In order to ensure proper coordination and timely delivery of pesticide application technology which is compatible with the Department's water quality objectives, the Committee expects ARS to continue water quality research in conjunction with pesticide application research currently conducted at the Mid-South Research Center in Mississippi.

Weslaco, TX.—The Committee has added bill language allowing ARS to purchase land at Weslaco, TX.

Wheat quality laboratories.—The Committee concurs with the House in urging ARS to make further improvements at the ARS wheat research facilities in Manhattan, KS; Fargo, ND; Wooster, OH; and Pullman, WA.

Laboratory sales.—The Committee recommends striking House bill language providing for the sale and reinvestment of funds from such sale of facilities in California, France, and Italy.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $41,016,000
Budget estimate, 1992	46,100,000
House allowance	49,473,000
Committee recommendation	61,818,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $533 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The "Buildings and facilities" account is established for the acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or used by, the Agricultural Research Service. Routine construction or replacement items would continue to be funded under the limitations contained in the regular account.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $61,818,000 for these federally-owned and operated facilities. This amount is $15,718,000 more than the budget estimate, $12,345,000 more than the House level, and $20,802,000 more than the amount provided in 1991. These funds shall remain available until expended.

The following table shows the Committee's provisions:

ARS BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

State and facility	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Arkansas: Rice research center, Stuttgart	223		223	735
California: U.S. Salinity Lab, Riverside	5,050	10,250	5,050	5,550
Colorado: National Seed Storage Lab, Fort Collins	3,000			
Georgia: Poultry Disease Lab, Athens		400		400
Idaho: National Small Grains Germplasm Repository	200			
Illinois: Northern Regional Research Center			3,650	
Iowa:				
National Animal Disease Center, Ames	300			
National Pork Research Center			1,000	2,600
Louisiana: Southern Regional Research Center		3,400	1,300	2,600
Maryland: Beltsville Agricultural Research Center	16,000	20,000	16,000	16,000
Michigan: Regional Poultry Research Center			500	
Minnesota: Soil and Water Lab, Morris	300		1,350	
Mississippi:				
Center for Natural Products	5,175		5,175	5,175
National Center for Warm Water Aquaculture	1,200		1,200	1,000
New York: Plum Island Animal Disease Center		7,000	3,000	3,000
North Dakota: Plant science greenhouse complex—NDSU	425			
Ohio: Demonstration Greenhouse			375	
Oklahoma:				
South Central Agricultural Research Center, Lane	1,450			2,000
Southern Plains Range Research Station, Woodward				347
Oregon: Columbia Basin Agricultural Research Center, Pendleton	168			
Oregon/Washington/Idaho: Northwest Small Fruit Center	175		1,900	2,025
Texas:				
ARS Bee Lab, Weslaco	1,700		1,700	
Plant Stress Lab, Texas Tech University	600		2,000	
Washington: U.S. Fruit and Vegetable Lab, Yakima	5,050	5,050	5,050	5,050
Wisconsin: Cereal Crops Research Unit, barley/malt lab				350
Miscellaneous: Repair and improvement, ARS facilities				14,986
Total	41,016	46,100	49,473	61,818

Arizona.—The Committee concurs with the House in requesting a report on the feasibility of moving the Water Conservation Laboratory and the Western Cotton Research Laboratory from Phoenix, AZ, to the Maricopa Agriculture Center in Arizona.

Rice Research Center.—The Committee provides $735,000 additional planning funds for the Rice Research Center at Stuttgart, AR. The amount, together with funds previously appropriated, provides a total of $958,000 for planning of this facility.

U.S. Salinity Laboratory.—An increase of $500,000 above the House allowance is recommended for the U.S. Salinity Laboratory at Riverside, CA. With the $5,550,000, the Committee understands that construction can commence.

Horticultural Research Laboratory.—The Committee concurs with the House in requesting to be kept informed of the options for relocating the Horticultural Research Laboratory in Orlando, FL. Planning funds will be considered when an option is selected.

National Center for Warm Water Aquaculture.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 to complete planning and design and to continue construction of the National Center for Warm Water Aquaculture.

Natural Products Center.—The Committee concurs with the House in recommending $5,175,000 for additional construction funding for the National Center for Natural Products, the same amount as provided in 1991. The Committee is aware ARS and CSRS are cooperating with the University of Mississippi to complete this new facility which will serve Federal and State researchers in the development of new natural products, such as taxol, an anticancer agent. With completion of the new facility nearing, the Committee will expect ARS, acting as the lead Federal agency for natural product research, to develop and submit a report to the Committee outlining a natural products research program plan utilizing the Center. The plan is to be developed in cooperation with CSRS and the university and should focus on the beneficial uses of agricultural commodities in the manufacture of pharmaceuticals, biological and biosafe pesticides, and other natural products.

Plum Island Animal Disease Center.—The Committee concurs with the House in providing $3,000,000 for consolidation of existing facilities and for continued restoration work at the Plum Island Animal Disease Center.

Southern Plains Range Research Center.—The Committee provides $347,000 for greenhouse facilities at the Southern Plains Range Research Station at Woodward, OK. These improvements are needed to continue research on gamagrass, a highly productive perennial forage with significant potential for the dairy and beef industries throughout the southern and eastern United States.

Northwest Small Fruit Center.—The Committee provides $2,025,000 to complete construction of the Northwest Small Fruit Center.

U.S. Vegetable Laboratory.—The Committee has not provided construction funds for the U.S. Vegetable Laboratory at Charleston, SC. Design will be completed by the end of fiscal year 1992 and the Committee will consider providing construction funds in fiscal year 1993.

Plant Moisture Stress Laboratory.—Design of the Plant Moisture Stress Laboratory at Lubbock, TX, will commence in fiscal year 1992. The Committee will consider providing construction funds in fiscal year 1993.

Cereal Crops Research Unit.—The Committee provides $350,000 for construction of a greenhouse for the Cereal Crops Research Unit's Barley and Malt Laboratory at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Repair and improvement.—For repair and improvement of ARS facilities, the Committee recommends $14,986,000. This amount is the same as the level provided by the House and requested in the budget under the "ARS program" account.

Cooperative State Research Service

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $388,489,000
Budget estimate, 1992	384,151,000
House allowance	412,886,000
Committee recommendation	419,788,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $5,050 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Cooperative State Research Service is the U.S. Department of Agriculture's principal entree to the university system of the United States for the purpose of conducting agricultural research as authorized by the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended (7 U.S.C. 361a-361i); the Cooperative Forestry Research Act of 1962, as amended (16 U.S.C. 582a-7); Public Law 89-106, section (2), as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i); and the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.). Through these authorities, the U.S. Department of Agriculture participates with State and other sources of funding to encourage and assist the State institutions in the conduct of agricultural research through the State agricultural experiment stations of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories; by approved schools of forestry; by the 1890 land-grant institutions and Tuskegee University; by colleges of veterinary medicine; and by other eligible institutions.

The Cooperative State Research Service participates in a nationwide system of agricultural research program planning and coordination among the State institutions, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the agricultural industry of America.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table summarizes Committee recommendations for the Cooperative State Research Service.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Payments under Hatch Act	162,293	168,298	168,785	168,785
Cooperative forestry research	17,820	12,975	18,533	18,533
Payments to 1890 colleges and Tuskegee University	26,346	27,321	27,400	27,400
Special research grants (Public Law 89-106):				
Aflatoxin (Illinois)	131	.....	175	.....
Agribusiness management (Mississippi)	75	.....	75	75
Agricultural diversification (Hawaii)	154	.....	.....	154
Agricultural management systems (Massachusetts)	275	.....	.....	261
Agricultural trade (North Dakota)	596	.....	.....	350
Agriculture utilization research	500	.....	.....	.....
Alternative cropping systems (Southeast)	277	.....	270	280
Alternative crops (North Dakota)	497	.....	.....	700
Alternative marine and fresh water species (Mississippi)	275	.....	275	275
Alternative pest control (Arkansas)	1,391	.....	.....	1,400
Alternative to dinoseb (Oregon)	225	.....	225	225
Animal waste disposal (Michigan)	37	.....	150	.....
Appalachian hardwoods (West Virginia)	.....	.....	.....	750
Apple quality research (Michigan)	94	.....	94	.....
Aquaculture (Illinois)	.....	.....	250	.....
Aquaculture research (general)	656	.....	656	.....
Aquaculture (Stoneville)	600	.....	600	800
Aquaculture (Louisiana)	.....	.....	.....	440
Asparagus yield decline (Michigan)	94	.....	94	.....
Babcoc Institute (Wisconsin)	.....	.....	.....	150
Bean and beet research (Michigan)	189	.....	189	.....
Beef carcass evaluation and identification (Iowa, New York, Georgia, Texas, Illinois)	.....	.....	267	.....

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Beef fat content (Iowa)	200			275
Belgium endive (Massachusetts)	67			
Blueberry shoestring virus control (Michigan)	92			
Broom snakeweed (New Mexico)	150		200	200
Celery fusarium (Michigan)	39		39	
Center for rural studies (Vermont)				75
Chesapeake Bay aquaculture	437		437	
Competitiveness of agricultural products (Washington)			500	850
Competitiveness of forest products (Washington)			250	
CONSOIL (Wisconsin)				50
Controlled environment production systems (Pennsylvania)			300	
Cool season legume (Idaho, Washington)	375		375	400
Cottonseed extraction and oil refining (Texas)	75		75	
Cranberry/blueberry disease and breeding (New Jersey)	260		260	260
CRP acreage usage (Missouri)				100
Dairy and beef photoperiod (Michigan)	33			
Dairy goat research (Texas)	75		75	
Delta rural revitalization (Mississippi)	175		175	175
Dogwood anthracnose (Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee)	100		100	175
Dried bean (North Dakota)	93			100
Eastern filbert blight (Oregon)	75		75	85
Enhanced livestock production (North Dakota)	250			250
Environmental research (New York)	297		650	
Ethanol research (Arkansas)	100		250	
Expanded wheat pasture (Oklahoma)	275		275	400
Export development (Kentucky)				227
Export services (Oregon)	348			
Farm and rural business finance (Illinois, Arkansas)				250
Fish marketing (Oregon, Rhode Island)				340
Floriculture (Hawaii)	296			296
Food and Agriculture Policy Institute	750		750	750
Food irradiation (Iowa)	100		200	275
Food marketing policy center (Connecticut)	393		393	393
Food processing center (Nebraska)				80
Food safety consortium (Arkansas, Kansas, Iowa)	1,845			2,000
Food systems research group (Wisconsin)	261		261	261
Genetic engineering of plants (Ohio)			300	
Global change		5,000		
Grasshopper biocontrol (North Dakota)	73			75
Great Plains Agriculture Policy Center (Kansas, Oklahoma)				200
Human nutrition (Iowa)	300		500	500
Human nutrition (Louisiana)	800		500	800
Human nutrition research (New York)	556		800	
Improved dairy management practices (Pennsylvania)			350	
Integrated forest management (Arkansas)	25			
Integrated orchard management (Vermont)	49			50
Integrated pest management	4,000	5,000	4,915	4,000
Integrated production systems (Oklahoma)	186		186	200
International livestock program (Kansas)	94			95
Iowa biotechnology consortium	1,756			2,150
Irrigation/fish production (Arkansas)	167			167
Leafy spurge biocontrol (Montana)	125			125
Livestock and dairy policy (New York, Texas)	525		525	525
Lowbush blueberry research (Maine)	202		185	185
Low-input agriculture (Minnesota)	174		250	
Maple research (Vermont)	99			100
Mechanical tomato harvester (Pennsylvania)			240	
Mesquite and prickly pear (Texas)				200
Michigan biotechnology institute	2,246		2,470	
Midwest agricultural products (Iowa)				700

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Midwest plant biotechnology consortium	2,730	.....	3,000	2,730
Milk safety (Pennsylvania)	283	.....	.....	285
Milkweed research (Nebraska)	80	.....	80	80
Mink research (Oregon)	.....	.....	.....	92
Minor crop pest control (Hawaii)	285	.....	285	285
Minor use animal drugs	450	429	500	429
Mosquito research (Arkansas, California, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas)	453	.....	453	.....
Multicropping strategies for aquaculture	150	.....	.....	150
National biological impact assessment	300	300	300	300
Nematode resistance genetic engineering (New Mexico)	150	.....	150	.....
New uses for agricultural products (Ohio)	140	.....	140	.....
Nonfood agricultural products (Nebraska)	110	.....	.....	110
Oil from jojoba (New Mexico)	200	.....	200	200
Oregon-Massachusetts biotechnology	500	.....	500	575
Peach tree short life (South Carolina)	192	.....	192	192
Peanut breeding (Georgia)	47	.....	.....	.....
Pecan weevil (Oklahoma)	25	.....	.....	.....
Pest control alternatives (South Carolina)	.....	.....	.....	250
Pesticide clearance	3,000	3,000	4,000	3,000
Pesticide impact assessment	2,968	2,968	2,968	2,968
Pesticide research (Washington)	484	.....	250	850
Phytophthora root rot (New Mexico)	125	.....	150	150
Plastic from cornstarch	40	.....	.....	.....
Potato research	1,371	.....	1,500	1,371
Poultry (Georgia)	.....	.....	.....	250
Preservation and processing research (Oklahoma)	265	.....	265	300
Prime farmland reclamation (Illinois, Kentucky)	609	.....	.....	.....
Procerum root disease (Virginia)	.....	.....	50	.....
Product development and marketing center (Maine)	.....	.....	.....	250
Regional barley gene mapping project	262	.....	412	412
Regionalized implication of farm programs (Missouri)	348	.....	348	348
Rural development centers (Pennsylvania, Iowa, North Dakota, Mississippi, Oregon)	500	.....	500	500
Rural economic development (Georgia)	744	.....	.....	744
Rural environment research (Illinois)	75	.....	150	.....
Rural policies institute (Arkansas, Nebraska, Missouri)	375	.....	.....	675
Russian wheat aphid (Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Colorado)	350	.....	435	350
Safflower (North Dakota, Montana)	248	.....	.....	250
Sandhills grazing management practices	99	.....	99	.....
Seafood harvesting, processing, and marketing (Mississippi)	361	.....	361	361
Seedless table grapes (Arkansas)	50	.....	.....	.....
Seedstocks enhancement (North Dakota)	198	.....	.....	.....
Small fruit research (Oregon, Washington, Idaho)	125	.....	250	.....
Southwest consortium for plant genetics and water resources	400	.....	400	400
Soybean bioprocessing (Iowa)	200	.....	.....	350
Soybean cyst nematode (Missouri)	333	.....	385	333
STEEP II—water quality in Northwest	980	.....	980	980
Stone fruit decline (Michigan)	283	.....	283	.....
Stored grain insects (Kansas)	285	.....	285	285
Subirrigation research (Michigan)	262	.....	600	.....
Sunflower insects (North Dakota, South Dakota)	194	.....	.....	200
Sustainable agriculture systems (Nebraska)	.....	.....	.....	120
Swine (Minnesota)	.....	.....	175	.....
TCK smut (wheat)	250	.....	250	250
Technology transfer development (Iowa)	.....	.....	.....	200
Tropical and subtropical research	3,320	.....	3,320	3,320
Urban pests	76	.....	.....	76

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Water conservation (Nevada)			250	
Water management (Alabama)	397			400
Water quality	8,000	10,000	10,000	8,000
Weed control (North Dakota)				500
Wheat genetic research (Kansas)	149			149
Wheat marketing (Oregon)				300
White mold (Ohio)			70	
Wild rice research (Minnesota)	50		100	
Wood utilization (Oregon, Mississippi, Michigan)	2,852		2,852	2,852
Wool research (Texas, Wyoming, Montana)	198		250	250
World food systems (Indiana, Ohio)	357		380	357
Youth science camp (West Virginia)	94			
Subtotal, special grants	61,976	26,697	58,299	61,978
Competitive research grants NRI:				
Plant systems	35,000	53,000	40,000	40,000
Soybean	(493)		(493)	
Alcohol fuels	(514)		(514)	
Animal systems	20,000	30,000	25,000	25,000
Brucellosis	(475)		(475)	
Nutrition, food quality and health	4,000	13,000	4,000	9,000
Global warming			5,000	2,000
Natural resources and the environment	14,000	23,000	18,000	18,000
Processes antecedent to adding value and developing new products		4,000	3,000	4,000
Markets, trade and policy		2,000	4,000	4,000
Total, competitive research grants	73,000	125,000	99,000	102,000
Animal health and disease (Sec. 1433)	5,551		5,551	5,551
Critical Agricultural Materials Act	800		300	1,300
Aquaculture centers (Sec. 1475)	3,750		4,000	3,750
International trade centers (Sec. 1419)	3,152			
Rangeland research grants (Sec. 1480)	475		475	475
Alternative crops	1,168	918	1,168	500
Sustainable agriculture	6,725	4,450	6,725	6,725
Weather information service (sec. 1640)				400
Higher education [1]	7,500	5,500	5,000	5,000
Federal administration:				
1890 capacity building	8,250	11,000	8,580	8,580
Ag in classroom	170	208	208	170
Agricultural biotechnology	375	400	400	375
Center for Agricultural and Rural Development (Iowa)	741		750	
Geographic information system	747		1,000	1,000
Maize genetics research center (North Dakota)	100			400
Mississippi Valley State University	642		668	642
Office of Grants and Program Systems	568	334	334	334
Pay costs and FERS		550	550	550
Peer panels	250	500	260	250
Shrimp aquaculture (Hawaii, Mississippi)	3,365		3,500	3,365
Vocational aquaculture education	500		500	500
Water quality (Illinois, Iowa, North Dakota)	1,600		900	500
Alternative fuels characterization lab (North Dakota)	250			250
Herd management (Tennessee)	375			475
Total, Federal administration	17,933	12,992	17,650	17,391
Total, Cooperative State Research Service	388,489	384,151	412,886	419,788

[1] Does not include $2,850,000 permanent appropriation under Morrill-Nelson Act.

Individual items are discussed below:

Special research grants under Public Law 89-610.—The Committee recommends a total of $61,978,000. Specifics of individual grant allowances are included in the accompanying table. Special items are discussed below. The Committee agrees with the intent expressed by the House that recipients of special research grants be allowed to compete for competitive grants. The Department consistently reduces special research grant budget requests while increasing requests for competitive research grants. It would be consistent with the Department's position to allow special research grant recipients to compete for competitive research grants.

Appalachian hardwoods.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Appalachian Export Center for Hardwoods at West Virginia University.

Aquaculture.—To support the expansion of aquaculture research at Louisiana State University's Agriculture Experiment Station to include redfish, alligators, and other species which can provide needed profitable diversification, $440,000 is provided, an increase of $100,000 over the 1991 level. Previously, Louisiana aquaculture was funded under aquaculture general.

Aquaculture (Stoneville).—Of the $800,000 provided for this grant, the Committee recommends $200,000 for continued studies of the use of acoustics in aquaculture research to be conducted by the National Center for Physical Acoustics in cooperation with the Mississippi Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station [MAFES] and the Delta Research and Extension Center in Stoneville.

Babcoc Institute.—The Committee recommends $150,000 in start-up funding for the Babcoc Institute for International Dairy Research and Development at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. The institute will link the U.S. dairy industry with the rest of the world through degree training, continuing education, technology transfer, adaptive research, scientific collaboration, and market analysis.

Center for Rural Studies.—A total of $75,000 is provided to the Center for Rural Studies at the University of Vermont. The funding will allow the center to develop programs beyond the reach of Vermont and develop technology and marketing assistance programs for small business and family farms.

Competitiveness of agricultural and forest products.—For research on the competitiveness of agricultural and forest products at Washington State University and the University of Washington, the Committee recommends $850,000. The House provided $500,000 for research at Washington State University and $250,000 for research at the University of Washington and the University of West Virginia.

CONSOIL.—The Committee recommends $50,000 for the conservation of natural resources through sharing of information layers [CONSOIL] at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. CONSOIL, funded under the National Center for Resource Innovations [NCRI], is an effective program that allows rapid determination of highly erodible lands.

CRP acreage usage.—In recognizing the need to provide the Congress and the U.S. Department of Agriculture with the economic and environmental implications of implementing a broad set of

policy tools for influencing the postcontract use of CRP acreage, the Committee provides $100,000 for research at the University of Missouri.

Export development.—To support the export of agricultural products from the Southeastern States, the Committee provides $227,000 to the export center at the University of Kentucky.

Farm and rural business finance.—The growing complexities of agriculture are perhaps nowhere greater evidenced than in the area of finance. Therefore, the Committee recommends $250,000 for the Center for Farms and Rural Business Finance, a partnership of the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, to assist farmers and rural businesses with the growing demands of the financial marketplace.

Fish marketing.—To support joint research in the marketing and trade of fisheries at the University of Rhode Island and Oregon State University, the Committee provides $340,000. This research will benefit U.S. fishermen, aquaculturists, marketers, and consumers.

Food Processing Center.—In recognizing the need to support rural development, new uses for agricultural commodities, value-added products and nonfarm income opportunities for farmers, the Committee provides $80,000 for the Food Processing Center at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This project will provide professional consultation and technological services to expanding businesses, model cooperative marketing programs for aquaculture and specialty grains, and develop a distribution network for new food products.

Great Plains Agricultural Policy Center.—For research on the impact of Federal farm policies on the Great Plains States, $200,000 is provided for a joint project between Oklahoma State University and Kansas State University.

Mesquite and prickly pear.—The Committee provides $200,000 to support research on the commercial utilization of mesquite and prickly pear. Research on prickly pear will be directed toward finding more cold tolerant and palatable varieties, and toward developing nonfood, nonfeed use. Research on mesquite will be directed toward the improvement of cultivation and harvesting methods, and the development of commercially viable mesquite wood products. This research will be conducted by Texas A&I University in Kingsville, TX.

Midwest agricultural products.—The Committee provides $700,000 for applied research to improve the competitiveness and marketability of agricultural sector products in the Midwest and the dissemination of that research to be coordinated by Iowa State University.

Mink research.—To improve the health and welfare of domestically raised fur-bearing animals, the Committee recommends $92,000 for ongoing research at Oregon State University.

Pest control alternatives.—A total of $250,000 is provided by the Committee for research at Clemson University to study crop-pest interactions and to develop better control methods through biotechnology, crop management, and improved uses of environmentally safe pesticides.

Poultry.—To support expanded poultry research at the University of Georgia on product yield, carcass quality, product development, infectious diseases, and energy conservation, the Committee recommends $250,000.

Product Development and Marketing Center.—The Committee recommends $250,000 for the Northern New England Products Development and Marketing Center at the University of Maine. The center, specializing in agricultural, marine, and forest products, will develop and promote new value-added products and improve New England's ability to realize its export potential.

Russian wheat aphid.—The Committee does not concur with the increase provided by the House of $85,000 for Colorado. The Committee provides $350,000, the same amount as in 1991, for Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho.

Sustainable agriculture systems.—To bolster the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's widely recognized leadership role in promoting sustainable agriculture, the Committee recommends $120,000. These funds will be used as seed money to establish interdisciplinary teams to focus on the sustainable agricultural systems concept.

Technology transfer development.—The Committee recommends $200,000 for a grant for Iowa State University to analyze the benefits of establishing a worldwide integrated agricultural education and technology transfer development program.

Weed control.—For environmentally compatible weed control systems at North Dakota State University, the Committee recommends $500,000. Weed control is a major economic and biological problem to farmers in the region. The goal of this research is to reduce herbicides needed for weed control by 20 percent in the next 5 years—providing millions of dollars of savings to farmers in the region.

Wheat marketing.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue multicommodity agricultural marketing activities at the Western Regional Wheat Marketing Center at Albers Mill in Portland, OR. The center provides technical assistance necessary to meet quality standards and overcome other trade barriers imposed by importers and to assist in penetrating new and expanding markets in the Pacific rim.

Competitive research grants.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $102,000,000. This amount is $23,000,000 less than the budget estimate, $29,000,000 more than was available in 1991, and $3,000,000 more than the House level. Of the amount provided, $25,000,000 will not be made available until September 20, 1992. Specific allowances for the various competitive grant categories, along with the 1991 budget request, and House levels are shown in the accompanying table.

The Committee will expect the competitive grants program to be directed toward meeting the research goals outlined in section 1602 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990. These goals would include the protection of the environment, enhancing long-term viability, and competitiveness of U.S. agriculture, providing economic opportunities in rural America, and enhancing human health.

For markets, trade, and policy, additional attention should be given to research involving technology assessment and marketing opportunities for agricultural commodities grown using sustainable and alternative agricultural practices.

The Committee remains determined to see that quality research and enhanced human resources development in the agricultural and related sciences be a nationwide commitment. Therefore, the Committee has continued its direction that 10 percent of the competitive research grant funds be used for a USDA experimental program to stimulate competitive research [USDA-EPSCoR]. The Committee directs the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the National Science Foundation, to establish such a program and in so doing, to take advantage of the State-based EPSCoR infrastructure improvement program already in place in all States designated by NSF as EPSCoR States. The purpose of this program shall be both to assure merit-based research in areas of science important to the Department's mission and to develop the science infrastructure in those States who have traditionally been less successful in competing for such research. Grant applications are to be solicited from each State EPSCoR committee in furtherance of these objectives.

Although a specific allowance has not been cited, the Committee expects the Department to continue to provide competitive grants for forestry research.

Critical Agricultural Materials Act.—The Committee recommends $1,300,000 for activities authorized by the Critical Agricultural Materials Act. This appropriation is $1,000,000 more than the House allowance. Included in this recommendation is $800,000 for the research program at the National Center for Physical Acoustics at the University of Mississippi. The Committee further recommends $500,000 to continue the university-based program to expand uses of agricultural-based products and alternative agriculture crops in the U.S. polymer industry to be coordinated at the Mississippi Polymer Institute.

Alternative crops.—The Committee recommends $500,000 for alternative crop research to continue research on crambe and winter rapeseed. This is the same amount as in 1991.

Weather information service.—The Committee recommends $400,000 for a regional agricultural weather information service as proposed by the Earth System Science Institute at the University of North Dakota in cooperation with North Dakota State University. The service will provide year-round interpretative agricultural outlooks, develop improved methods of interpreting and presenting weather information for production agriculture, train agricultural meteorologists, and develop extension programs to train agricultural producers and advisers in the use of enhanced climate and weather information.

Higher education.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for higher education. This amount is $2,500,000 less than the 1991 level. The Committee concurs with the House in providing $3,500,000 for graduate fellowships and $1,500,000 for challenge grants. The Committee recommends bill language providing proper authorization under current law for the higher education programs.

Once again, the Committee rejects the administration proposal to repeal the permanent appropriation of the Morrill-Nelson Act which will continue to provide higher education funds to every State.

Federal administration.—The Committee provides $17,391,000 for Federal administration, $259,000 less than the House level, $542,000 less than the 1991 level, and $4,399,000 more than the budget request. The Committee recommendations are reflected in the table above.

Included is $1,000,000 for a cooperative agreement with the National Center for Resource Innovations [NCRI] for development of pilot projects using a geographic information system for land use management purposes. This project was begun in 1990 in Georgia, Arkansas, and the Chesapeake Bay, and it has been expanded to Washington and North Dakota.

The Committee does not concur with the House in providing the entire increase of $253,000 for the State of Washington. Rather, the Committee will expect the National Center for Resource Innovations to distribute the money in the best interest of the program. In that regard, the Committee urges the NCRI board of directors to place as much administrative responsibility with the project sites as possible in order to allow the Washington, DC, office to focus primarily on technology transfer.

Furthermore, since land-grant institutions have administrative personnel available for CSRS grant submission, NCRI should give consideration to assigning a single land-grant institution associated with NCRI this responsibility and report to the Committee on its findings.

The water quality portion of the Federal administration is to continue research at the University of North Dakota in the amount of $500,000, a decrease of $250,000 from the amount received in 1991 by the university.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $62,867,000
Budget estimate, 1992	25,000,000
House allowance	62,529,000
Committee recommendation	60,769,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $817 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The "Buildings and facilities" account was established for the acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities which directly or indirectly support research and extension programs of the Department.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For buildings and facilities, the Committee recommends $60,769,000. This amount is $1,760,000 less than the House level and $2,098,000 less than the 1991 amount. The budget requested $25,000,000 for a competitive grant program. The following table summarizes the Committee's provisions:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

State and facility	1991 appropriation	1992 request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Alabama:				
Tuskegee University	700			
Wallace State Junior College Wellness Center				([1])
Arkansas:				
Center for Alternative Pest Control	811			500
Poultry and Isolation Facility, University of Arkansas/ Fayetteville	337			250
Poultry Center of Excellence	3,750			3,350
Arizona: Agriculture research complex—environmental stress lab	([1])			200
California:				
Alternative pest control containment and quarantine, University of California	([1])		414	
Grape Importation Facility, University of California at Davis	897		2,321	
Florida: Biotechnology Institute, University of Florida-Alachua	2,690		500	1,180
Georgia:				
Agricultural livestock poultry facility				([1])
Biocontainment Research Center, University of Georgia	1,992		500	750
Center for Advanced Water Technology, Savannah	([1])			272
National Laboratory for Environmentally Sound Production Agriculture-Tifton	300			3,250
Vidalia onion storage research facility	([1])			450
Hawaii: Center for Tropical/Subtropical Agriculture	5,675			3,842
Idaho: Biotechnology Facility	590			500
Illinois:				
Biotechnology Center, Northwestern University	([1])		1,200	
National Soybean Laboratory, University of Illinois	1,617		1,987	
Indiana: Molecular and Cellular Biotech Facility	1,500		4,000	
Iowa:				
Center for Food and Industrial Agriculture Product Development, Iowa State University	3,400			
Human Nutrition Center, Iowa State University	1,755			
Kansas: Throckmorton Plant Science Center, Kansas State University	3,731		500	2,641
Maine:				
Food Safety Laboratory, University of Maine	93			
Masardis Research Farm	157			
Presque Isle Farm Building consolidation	150			
Maryland: Institute for Natural Resources and Environmental Science, University of Maryland	([1])		1,000	1,000
Massachusetts: Center/hunger, poverty, nutrition and policy	([1])		500	633
Michigan: Food Toxicology Center, Michigan State University	5,076		15,712	
Mississippi: Biological Technology Center for Water and Wetland Resources			200	([1])
Missouri: Bennett Living and Learning Center	([1])			290
Montana: Bioscience Research Laboratory, Montana State University	1,250		500	1,625
Nebraska: Center for Advanced Technology, University of Nebraska	4,500			4,500
Nevada: Biochemistry and biology, University of Nevada			500	
New Jersey: Plant Bioscience Facility, Rutgers University	2,544		2,544	3,544
New York:				
Cornell Research Greenhouse			750	
New York Botanical Garden	([1])		1,300	1,400
North Carolina:				
Bowman-Gray Center at Wake Forest			3,650	
Biotechnology Facility	750		1,450	1,450
North Dakota:				
Animal Care Facility, North Dakota State University	([1])			500

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State and facility	1991 appropriation	1992 request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Engineering and biomechanics building				([1])
Facilities completion				500
Food processing pilot plant				750
Ind Ag and Communication Center, North Dakota State University	2,511			
Inst/Ag Health Science and Rural Medicine, University of North Dakota	2,892			5,870
Inst/Ag and Rural Human Research Development, Minot State University				480
Seed Research and Regulatory Facility, North Dakota State University	([1])			1,000
Ohio:				
Plant Science Research Facility, University of Toledo			550	
Oklahoma: National Center for Bovine/Equine Biotechnology				450
Oregon:				
Regional Food Innovation Center				([1])
Seafood Center, Oregon State University	([1])		218	
Pennsylvania:				
Center for Food Marketing, St. Joseph's University	600		2,420	3,000
Children's Hospital, Pittsburgh				([1])
Rhode Island: Building consolidation, University of Rhode Island	1,904			500
South Dakota: Northern Plains Biostress Laboratory, South Dakota State University	1,970		500	2,530
Tennessee:				
Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Research Complex, University of Tennessee in Knoxville			([1])	1,850
Nursery Crop Research Station	248			604
Texas: Inst/Biosciences and Technology, Texas A&M	2,797		4,700	3,021
Utah: Biotechnology Laboratory, Utah State University	280			1,248
Vermont: Tree Physiology and Maple Research Laboratory, University of Vermont	372			
Virginia: Agriculture Biotechnology Facility, Virginia Polytechnic Institute	918		1,125	
Washington: Animal Disease Biotechnology Facility, Washington State University	1,210		3,030	1,210
Wisconsin:				
Agriculture Biotechnology/Genetics Facility, University of Wisconsin/Madison	2,600		9,858	3,429
College of Natural Resources, University of Wisconsin—Sevens Point			([1])	([1])
Research greenhouse	([1])			
Rural Health Information and Technology Initiative Medical College of Wisconsin	([1])			1,500
Wyoming: Environmental Simulation Facility, University of Wyoming	([1])		500	500
Competitive Facilities Program		25,000		
Miscellaneous: Fund for reports [1]	300		100	200
Total	62,867	25,000	62,529	60,769

[1] Report on need and support for proposed facility.

Center for Alternative Pest Control.—The Committee is aware that, in connection with funds provided for the Center for Alternative Pest Control, efforts are underway to restore the historically significant Carnall Hall to become an integral part of the center. In that light, the Committee will expect a report on the feasibility of this restoration project.

New York State Botanical Garden.—Regarding the botanical garden's new library/herbarium, the Committee understands that because of the sheer size of the collections, the garden must build a bigger and more modern herbarium. The garden estimates that the total project cost will be approximately $26,000,000. One-half of that total will be met in donations from the private sector. The Committee is aware of the fund commitments of New York State of $1,000,000 and of New York City of $6,400,000. The Committee notes its strong support for the project and will consider providing additional funds in the future.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $398,478,000
Budget estimate, 1992	410,817,000
House allowance	417,007,000
Committee recommendation	412,129,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $5,180 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

Cooperative extension work was established by the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, as amended. Legislation authorizes the Department of Agriculture to provide, through the land-grant colleges, cooperative extension work that consists of the development of practical applications of research knowledge and the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations of existing or improved practices or technologies in agriculture, uses of solar energy with respect to agriculture, home economics, related subjects, and to encourage the application of such information by demonstrations, publications, through 4-H clubs, and other means to persons not attending or resident in the colleges.

To fulfill the requirements of the Smith-Lever Act, State and county extension offices in each State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Marianas, and Micronesia conduct educational programs to improve American agriculture and strengthen the Nation's families and communities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table summarizes Committee action on the Extension Service:

EXTENSION SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Smith Lever 3(b) and 3(c)	252,608	262,100	262,712	262,712
Smith Lever 3(d):				
Pest management	7,450	10,000	8,950	7,450
Water quality	10,375	15,500	12,375	10,375
Farm safety	1,970	.....	1,970	2,970
Urban gardening	3,557	.....	3,557	.....
Food and nutrition education (EFNEP)	60,525	58,635	60,525	60,525
Pesticide impact assessment	3,230	3,580	3,580	3,230
Rural development centers	950	.....	950	950
Food safety	1,500	2,000	1,750	.....

EXTENSION SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Youth-at-risk	7,500	15,000	10,000	10,000
Indian reservation agents	1,000			2,000
1890's colleges and Tuskegee	22,794	27,000	25,755	23,706
1890's facilities grants	9,508	9,508	9,508	9,508
Renewable Resources Extension Act	2,765		2,765	2,765
Payments to D.C	991	1,000	1,031	991
Public Law 100–219 pilot projects	2,550		2,550	2,550
Agricultural telecommunications				2,000
Subtotal	389,273	404,323	407,978	401,732
Federal administration and special grants:				
General administration	5,181	5,697	5,388	5,181
Pilot technology transfer (Oklahoma, Mississippi)	331		331	331
Rural development (Nebraska)	194			200
Rural development (Oklahoma)	431			300
Crambe/rapeseed (Nebraska)	67		67	67
Agricultural development Pacific (Hawaii)	647		647	647
Pay costs		797	797	797
New England vertebrate (Massachusetts)	103			
Project future (Minnesota)	143		250	
Rural rehabilitation (Georgia)	256		256	256
Agricultural film (New York)	175			
Rural education pilot (North Dakota)	846			846
Presque Isle (Maine)	139			187
Crop simulation (Mississippi)	498		498	498
Southern Kentucky agricultural development strategy	49		50	
Income enhancement demonstration (Ohio)	145		250	
Pilot techology project (Wisconsin)			165	165
Satellite downlink program (Pennsylvania)			150	
Tourism pilot (New Mexico)			230	115
Rural health infrastructure (Alabama)				200
Beef producers' improvement (Arkansas)				200
Integrated cow/calf resources management (Iowa)				150
Home sewing (Mississippi, South Carolina, Alabama)				157
Extension specialist (Arkansas)				100
Subtotal, Federal administration	9,205	6,494	9,079	10,397
Total, Extension Service	398,478	410,817	417,057	412,129

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Farm safety.—The Committee is extremely pleased with the implementation of the Education and Assistance Program for Farmers With Disabilities being carried out in cooperation with the National Easter Seal Society. Extension Service agencies and Easter Seal societies in 10 States are collaborating on projects benefiting hundreds of farm families affected by disability. The Committee recommends $2,000,000 to continue this program. In 1991, $1,000,000 was provided and the House included this amount. There was no budget request.

The Committee understands that Extension Service and disability interests in nearly two dozen States are mobilized and eager to participate in the program. Unfortunately, it may be that all of these States will not be able to benefit fully under the program

with the amount provided for 1992. Therefore, the Committee recommends that a small portion of fiscal year 1992 national grant resources, not to exceed 10 percent, be available to provide information to extension services, disability groups, and others in States or geographic areas not otherwise served by demonstration projects funded under the program.

In addition, the Committee is aware of the growing concerns of rural Americans with regard to health and safety. Agriculture and forestry continue to be among the most hazardous occupations in the Nation. Rural residents face numerous obstacles to maintaining their health, including a shortage of health care professionals and increased health care costs. Rural public officials and community leaders are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain basic levels of community health services and facilities. The Committee recognizes that the Extension Service has been cooperating with the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] and other Federal and State agencies, as well as with public and private organizations, to provide health and safety education programs, including the program for rehabilitation of handicapped workers. As indicated earlier, this program is of great interest to the Committee and the Committee will expect the Extension Service to provide it with a report identifying the critical issues that can be effectively addressed through education and technical assistance. In preparing the report, the Extension Service is encouraged to continue its consultation with HHS and other appropriate private and public organizations.

Expanded food and nutrition education program [EFNEP].—The EFNEP program serves a segment of the population that is particularly susceptible to nutrition-related diseases and conditions, such as hypertension, diabetes, and coronary disease. The Committee expects the Department to place increased emphasis on providing nutrition information to those whose special needs require particular attention to dietary levels of vitamins, minerals, salt, fat, sugar, or other nutrients and components.

Through EFNEP, the Extension Service has demonstrated the potential to strengthen the health of low-income families by improving their diet. While the Committee believes that traditional EFNEP activities deserve continued strong support, the Extension Service should also be encouraged to utilize EFNEP to undertake focused efforts aimed at: reducing the incidence of low birthweight infants (low birthweight has been found to correlate positively with infant mortality and morbidity); and strengthening the physical and mental condition of children so that they can become fully functioning adults.

Successful model programs have already been developed that demonstrate that these objectives can be met through an EFNEP-type program. Some of these successful model programs include "Have a Healthy Baby" developed in Indiana, "Today's Mom" developed in Alabama, "Healthy Mothers/Healthy Babies Master Volunteer Program" developed in Missouri, and "Nutrition Education for Pregnant Adolescents" developed in North Carolina. The Alabama project was financed in part by EFNEP funds and received USDA's superior service award earlier this year.

Extension/EFNEP officials have expressed a strong interest in developing similar programs around the country under EFNEP sponsorship, beginning with modest pilot programs. The target audiences for these focused pilot programs could be pregnant teens and women, health care providers, day care providers, and parents of young children. The objectives of the programs could be, for example, to provide low-income pregnant women, teens, parents, or care givers the knowledge they need to help ensure successful pregnancies; improved health and hygiene, as well as nutrition counseling; and general physical and mental health instruction, especially for children.

The Committee strongly encourages the Secretary to consider using a portion of existing EFNEP program funding as incentives for encouraging such pilot programs. These pilot programs could be supported through grants awarded in a competitive manner. In reviewing applications for these grants, the Secretary could consider, for example, whether matching contributions were obtained from other sources and such additional program factors as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

Youth-at-risk.—For the Youth-at-Risk Program, the Committee recommends $10,000,000. However, the Committee does not concur with the House earmarks under the Youth-at-Risk Program of $300,000 for the joint outreach program between Southwest State University and the Minnesota Extension Service or to complete the editing of the film that was funded in 1991. The Committee does not oppose these projects; rather, it believes projects for this program should be competitively awarded.

Agricultural telecommunications.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for a new Agricultural Telecommunications Program authorized in the 1990 farm bill. The Committee notes the work of the Satellite Education Resources Consortium [SERC], a leading multistate distance-learning consortium, and urges the Department to participate with SERC to make affordable advanced telecommunications available to rural schools and communities.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

Rural health infrastructure.—A total of $200,000 is provided by the Committee for the University of Alabama at Birmingham Medical Center and the Alabama Cooperative Extension System of Auburn University to provide rural citizens with the technical support, information, and leadership training necessary to enable them to develop their own approaches for improving their health care status.

Beef producers improvement.—In order to provide improved beef production in the south central region, the Committee provides $200,000 for the Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service to participate in a small farms management demonstration project in conjunction with the South Central Small Farms Research Center and the University of Arkansas.

Integrated Cow/Calf Resources Management Program.—The Committee recommends $150,000 for the Integrated Cow-Calf Resources Management Program under the leadership of the Pathfinders RC&D. The program is designed to provide intensive management

and technical assistance to producers in an 11-county area of southeast Iowa.

Home sewing.—The Committee concurs with the House in recommending continuation of the home sewing project in Mississippi, South Carolina, and Alabama. The recommendation includes $157,000 for this program.

Booneville.—The Committee directs the Extension Service to provide a regional extension specialist at the Small Farms Research Center in Booneville, AR, to help disseminate the research generated to the 11-state service area of the center. An amount of $100,000 is provided for this effort.

National Agricultural Library

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $16,798,000
Budget estimate, 1992	17,453,000
House allowance	17,253,000
Committee recommendation	17,149,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $218 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The National Agricultural Library [NAL] had its mission outlined by the Organic Act of 1862, establishing the Department of Agriculture. The act sets forth a mission, "to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most comprehensive and general sense of the word," and placed upon the Secretary the responsibility to "procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of books * * *."

The NAL disseminates useful information about agricultural and other related sciences to scientists and researchers, administrators and managers, farmers, and the general public. In addition to providing traditional library services such as bibliographies, reference services and document delivery to agricultural scientists and researchers, NAL is expanding its role and serving a wider audience by using modern information dissemination technology to its fullest. Traditionally, the library has concentrated its thrust toward the agricultural scientists and researchers. The wider audience includes Federal, State, and local administrators, as well as the farmer, the small businessman, public groups at all levels, and the general public.

With approximately 1.8 million volumes of printed material on agriculture and supporting scientific disciplines, NAL has one of the largest collections of its kind in the world. Both current and historical information is collected and organized for effective utilization by a wide range of users.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the National Agricultural Library, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $17,149,000. This amount is $351,000 more than the 1991 level, $304,000 less than the budget request, and $104,000 less than the House level.

The appropriation includes $500,000 for the National Center for Agricultural Law Research and Information at the Leflar School of Law in Fayetteville, AR. This amount reflects an increase of $75,000 over the 1991 level. In addition to cementing a cooperative

research and publication relationship with the American Bar Association, the National Center produced several publications that quickly became the standards in the field. Also, the National Center has begun a cooperative arrangement with the USDA Office of General Counsel.

Also included is $250,000, the same amount as in 1991, for the Biotechnology Information Center. The Committee encourages NAL to serve as a focal point for information and resources services on biotechnology-related research.

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $497,000
Budget estimate, 1992	550,000
House allowance	550,000
Committee recommendation	535,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $6 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services provides direction and coordination in carrying out laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's marketing, inspection, and standardization related to grain; competitive marketing practices of livestock, meat and poultry, meat and poultry products, marketing orders, and various programs; veterinary services; and plant protection and quarantine. This Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Cooperative Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, and Packers and Stockyards Administration.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $535,000, $38,000 more than the 1991 level and $15,000 less than both the budget request and the House level.

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriated	User fees	Total APHIS
Appropriations, 1991	[1] $381,120,000	$13,000,000	$394,120,000
Budget estimate, 1992	324,378,000	85,922,000	410,300,000
House allowance	340,981,000	85,922,000	426,903,000
Committee recommendation	337,631,000	78,356,000	415,987,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $5,264 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service [APHIS] conducts programs to protect the animal and plant resources of the Nation from destructive pests and diseases in order to preserve the marketability of U.S. agricultural products within this country and abroad. The major areas of activity are discussed below.

Pest and disease exclusion.—The Agency participates in inspection, survey, and control activities in foreign countries to reinforce its domestic activities.

Plant and animal health monitoring.—The Agency conducts programs to assess animal and plant health and to detect endemic and exotic diseases and pests.

Pest and disease management programs.—The Agency carries out programs to control and eradicate infestations and animal diseases that threaten the United States; reduce agricultural losses caused by predatory animals, birds, and rodents; provide technical assistance to other cooperators such as States, counties, and farmer or rancher groups, and foundations; ensure compliance with interstate movement and other disease control regulations within the jurisdiction of the Agency.

Animal care.—The Agency conducts regulatory activities which ensure the humane care and treatment of animals and horses as required by the Animal Welfare and Horse Protection Acts. These activities include inspection of certain establishments which handle animals intended for research, exhibition, and as pets, and monitoring of certain horse shows.

Scientific and technical services.—The Agency performs other regulatory activities, including the development of standards for the licensing and testing of veterinary biologicals to ensure their safety and effectiveness; diagnostic activities in support of the control and eradication programs in other functional components; applied research aimed at reducing economic damage from vertebrate animals; development of new pest and animal damage control methods and tools; and regulatory oversight of genetically engineered products.

Agricultural quarantine inspection.—User fees are collected to cover the cost of inspection and quarantine activities at U.S. ports of entry to prevent the introduction of exotic animal and plant diseases and pests.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Pest and disease exclusion:				
Africanized bee	500		1,000	
Agricultural quarantine inspection	71,268	22,398	19,128	20,425
User fees	13,000	85,922	85,922	78,356
Subtotal, agricultural quarantine inspection	84,268	108,320	105,050	98,781
Foot-and-mouth disease	3,818	3,891	3,891	3,891
Import-export	8,929	10,208	9,918	9,627
International programs	4,238	4,498	4,498	4,498
Mediterranean fruit fly exclusion	9,557	10,052	10,052	10,052
Mexican fruit fly exclusion	1,060	1,164	1,164	1,164

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 appropriation	Fiscal year 1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Screwworm	33,391	34,011	34,011	34,011
Subtotal, pest and disease exclusion	145,761	172,144	169,584	162,024
Plant and animal health monitoring:				
Animal disease detection	8,335	10,057	9,452	8,846
Fruit fly detection	3,879	3,941	3,941	3,941
Pest detection	3,831	3,976	3,976	3,976
Subtotal, plant and animal health monitoring	16,045	17,974	17,369	16,763
Pest and disease management programs:				
Animal damage control—operations	24,588	20,410	25,822	25,811
Animal health compliance and enforcement	12,354	11,604	12,354	11,604
Biocontrol	4,944	7,549	7,549	5,149
Boll weevil	13,135	11,204	13,135	13,135
Brucellosis eradication	64,553	67,693	67,135	67,135
Cattle ticks	6,172	4,468	6,172	6,172
Citrus canker	1,264	.....	.....	.....
Golden nematode	808	862	862	862
Grasshopper and Mormon cricket	3,850	1,441	3,850	3,850
Reserve fund	5,000	.....	.....	5,000
Gypsy moth	4,877	5,162	5,162	5,162
Honey bee pests	502	531	531	531
Imported fire ant	4,232	1,617	3,732	3,732
Miscellaneous plant and animal diseases	2,094	2,211	3,475	2,211
National poultry improvement plan	229	245	245	245
Noxious weeds	1,081	561	1,081	561
Pink bollworm	2,800	1,042	2,800	2,800
Poultry diseases	673	722	722	722
Pseudorabies	6,554	6,713	7,554	6,713
Russian wheat aphid	2,400	.....	.....	2,400
Scrapie eradication	846	.....	1,846	846
Swine health protection	3,319	3,586	3,586	3,586
Tuberculosis	3,554	3,738	3,738	3,738
Witchweed	5,144	5,386	5,386	5,386
Subtotal, pest and disease management	174,973	156,745	176,737	177,351
Animal care:				
Animal welfare	9,688	9,331	9,688	9,688
Horse protection	359	382	382	382
Subtotal, animal care	10,047	9,713	10,070	10,070
Scientific and technical services:				
Animal damage control methods development	8,763	9,267	9,517	9,267
Biotechnology	5,697	6,301	6,194	6,087
Integrated systems acquisition project	.....	5,014	2,507	.....
Plant methods development laboratories	5,499	5,834	5,834	5,834
Veterinary biologics	9,165	9,756	9,756	9,756
Veterinary diagnostics	13,670	14,335	14,335	14,335
Subtotal, scientific and technical services	42,794	50,507	48,143	45,279
Contingency fund	4,500	3,217	5,000	4,500
Total, APHIS	394,120	410,300	426,903	415,987

For the salaries and expenses of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $415,987,000. This amount is $5,687,000 more than the budget esti-

mate, $21,867,000 more than the level for fiscal year 1991, and $10,916,000 less than the House amount.

Agricultural quarantine inspection.—For quarantine inspection, the Committee provides $98,781,000, an increase of $14,513,000 above the 1991 level, $6,269,000 less than the House and $9,539,000 less than the budget request.

The Committee has included $400,000, an increase of $195,000 over the 1991 level, for the purchase, installation, operation, and staffing of electronic baggage inspection equipment for use in Hawaii airports. In addition, the Committee expects APHIS to maintain its pre-April 1, 1990, policy of providing federally mandated inspections of cargo in Hawaii at no charge. Also, APHIS should maintain staffing at levels sufficient to prevent any deterioration in service.

In addition, the Committee concurs with the House by including bill language prohibiting the collection of user fees for AQI activities in Hawaii and Puerto Rico. The conference report accompanying Public Law 102–27 instructed APHIS not to include domestic user fees until Congress has considered them. APHIS has ignored this instruction; therefore, bill language with the prohibition is recommended.

Animal damage control.—The Committee recommends $25,811,000 for the animal damage control operations. This amount is $1,223,000 more than the 1991 level, $5,401,000 more than the budget request, and $11,000 less than the House level. The Committee provides an increase of $100,000 for cattail management in North Dakota for the control of blackbird depredation. The recommendation does not include an increase of $250,000 for wolf control in Minnesota.

The Committee concurs with the House in rejecting the budget proposal to reduce operations activities of the Animal Damage Control Program and in restoring funds, including cost-of-living increases. All existing offices and operations are to continue as in 1991.

The Committee believes that the program aimed at cormorants, other fish-eating birds, beaver damage to forest and crop lands, and other predators should continue to receive emphasis in the Delta States due to the significant losses experienced by farmers in the region. The Committee emphasizes that this program should be available to all States in the region.

For animal damage control methods development, the Committee has not included an increase of $250,000 for nonlethal control methods as proposed by the House.

Biocontrol.—For biological control, $5,149,000 is recommended. Included in this amount is $1,800,000 for leafy spurge control, the same amount as last year. Also included is $450,000, an increase of $175,000, for sweet potato whitefly.

Boll weevil.—The Committee provides $13,135,000 for the Boll Weevil Eradication Program, the same as the amount provided by the House and the amount provided in 1991. Included in this amount is $455,000 to develop and demonstrate a pilot geographic information system to prepare for future expansion of the eradication program into Mississippi. The technology developed through

this system will be transferred to other States as the program expands further.

Brown tree snake control.—Brown tree snakes have devastated bird populations in Guam and would have comparable effects if introduced in Hawaii. The Committee expects APHIS to work cooperatively with the Fish and Wildlife Service, the governments of Hawaii and Guam, the U.S. Postal Service, private courier and freight services, the Office of Territorial and International Affairs, and the Department of Defense to inspect all forms of Guam-to-Hawaii traffic, and to plan and devise early detection monitoring systems to be implemented in Hawaii.

Brucellosis.—For the Brucellosis Eradication Program, the Committee recommends $67,135,000, the same as the House level and $2,582,000 more than the amount provided in 1991. Of this amount, $287,000 is for the rapid completion brucellosis eradication plan in Mississippi.

To achieve final eradication of brucellosis in the next 5 years, funding must be adequate and properly allocated and surveillance programs must detect the least vestiges of disease. The Committee directs APHIS to allocate specific funds for brucellosis surveillance programs and use new technology for testing at livestock concentration points and/or slaughter sites.

Grasshopper and Mormon cricket.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,850,000 for the grasshopper and Mormon cricket programs. This amount is the same as the 1991 level, $7,409,000 more than the budget request, and $5,000,000 more than the House level. Of this amount, $5,000,000 is for the reserve fund and shall remain available until expended. The Committee directs that $3,430,000, the same amount as for 1991, of the reserve fund be used to continue the integrated pest management project in Idaho and North Dakota in 1992.

Imported fire ant.—The Committee recommends $3,732,000 for the Imported Fire Ant Program. This amount is $500,000 less than the 1991 level and the same as the House level. The Committee does not concur with the House in providing $500,000 to the Cooperative State Research Service IR-4 registration and minor use chemicals program.

The Committee is aware of the increasing scope of imported fire ant infestations and expects the Department to develop additional techniques, methodologies, and demonstration projects for eradication and control of the imported fire ant.

The Committee directs APHIS to work with ARS, CSRS, and appropriate universities to identify an effective fire ant control agent for use in a demonstration project.

In that light, the Committee expects APHIS to direct $200,000 from the imported fire ant program to the University of Arkansas at Monticello for research to develop methods and demonstration projects for imported fire ant control. APHIS is expected to collaborate with the university in these efforts using other funds provided for this program.

Mediterranean fruit fly.—The Committee recommends $10,052,000 for Mediterranean fruit fly operations, the same as the budget request and $495,000 more than the 1991 level. For test eradication of fruit fly infestations in Hawaii, the Committee has

provided $400,000 to be used only for releasing sterile fruit flies on Kauai. The Committee expects that these funds will be administered as they were in 1991. In addition, the Committee expects APHIS to provide at least 50 million sterile flies per week for this test eradication program.

Methods Development Center.—The APHIS Methods Development Center provides important fumigation and quarantine services and consultation to the ports and related businesses in the north Atlantic region. The proximity of this research laboratory to the ports that it serves is a valuable resource to the mid-Atlantic region which ultimately benefits the consumers served by the ports. The inspection and fumigation of the large volume of fresh fruits and food products which enter the ports at New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia are handled expeditiously with the assistance and expertise of the Methods Development Center. The Committee has included bill language delaying the relocation of the facility to enable the Department to consider appropriate alternate sites in the region for the location of the Methods Development Center.

Miscellaneous animal diseases.—The Committee recommendation includes no funds for scrapie in this category since a separate funding level has been designated. Funding is included to complete the eradication of citrus canker in Florida as proposed in the budget.

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service is urged to work with the Arkansas geographic information system site to help with pest and disease control.

Pink bollworm.—The Committee restores the funding level of $2,800,000 for the Pink Bollworm Program. This level will allow for the continued replacement of equipment at the new sterile moth rearing facility in Phoenix, AZ.

Pseudorabies.—The pseudorabies eradication program is a cooperative program that requires the involvement of both Federal and State governments, as well as individual pork producers. The Committee believes that additional flexibility is needed at the State and producer levels in the implementation of the program.

Accordingly, the Committee directs APHIS to allow 15 percent of the PRV program funds allocated to individual States to be used at the discretion of the State's pork producer association in consultation with the State advisory committee on PRV eradication. Funds may be used for PRV fee basis testing and supplies, cleanup of infected herds, cooperative agreement slaughter surveillance and traceback, herd monitoring, vaccine, and large herd cleanup programs. Use of program funds in these areas should not restrict APHIS program funding in any way.

Salmonella enteritidis.—The Committee acknowledges the critical need for an ongoing testing and control program for salmonella enteritidis in egg-producing poultry. Accordingly, as recommended by the House, it is expected that additional funds in the "Miscellaneous plant and animal disease" account and the contingency fund should be used, along with any necessary carryover funds, to continue the Salmonella Enteritidis Identification and Control Program.

Scrapie.—The Committee provides $846,000 for scrapie under this account, the same amount as in 1991 and $1,000,000 less than the

House allowance. The Committee discusses the scrapie indemnification, eradication, and control program under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Tropical bont tick.—The Committee concurs with the House in requesting a plan of action and cost estimates for the eradication of the tropical bont tick as a result of negotiations between APHIS and the Agency for International Development. The Committee is aware that the University of Florida has developed an important new technology to carry out this program and expects APHIS to cooperate with the university in developing the plan.

Tuberculosis.—Increased bovine tuberculosis infection in the United States threatens human health and increases costs from tracebacks, quarantine, testing, and indemnity. Tracebacks on numerous cases have been linked to Mexican origin. Therefore, the Committee directs APHIS to maximize use of the new technology for domestic eradication and Mexican cattle import testing.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $21,396,000
Budget estimate, 1992	23,400,000
House allowance	21,396,000
Committee recommendation	20,900,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $278 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

This account funds major nonrecurring construction projects in support of specific program activities and recurring construction, alterations, and repairs of existing APHIS facilities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For buildings and facilities of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $20,900,000. This amount is $496,000 less than the 1991 appropriation and the House level and $2,500,000 less than the budget request. The appropriation includes $5,400,000 for maintenance of buildings and facilities, $12,000,000 for construction of phase II of the Plant Germ Plasm Quarantine Center in Beltsville, MD, and $3,500,000 for modernization and construction of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center. The Committee recommends bill language providing that $4,998,000 of these funds shall become available September 20, 1992.

Food Safety and Inspection Service

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $448,882,000
Budget estimate, 1992	473,512,000
House allowance	473,512,000
Committee recommendation	473,512,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $5,835 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Food Safety and Inspection Service [FSIS] was established on June 17, 1981, by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1000-1 issued pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 (7 U.S.C. 2201).

The major objective of FSIS is to ensure that the Nation's commercial supply of meat and poultry products is safe, wholesome, and correctly labeled and packaged, as required by the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act.

The Meat and Poultry Inspection Program of FSIS provides in-plant inspection of all domestic plants preparing meat or poultry products for sale or distribution in commerce; reviews foreign inspection systems and establishments that prepare meat or poultry products for export to the United States; and provides technical and financial assistance to States which maintain meat and poultry inspection programs equal to that of the Federal Inspection Program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Food Safety and Inspection Service, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $473,512,000. This amount is $24,630,000 more than the amount provided in 1991 and the same as the budget estimate and the House level.

The Committee does not concur with the House report regarding "Labeling of Frankfurters and Similar Products Containing Binders and Extenders." The Committee believes further economic analysis is not necessary at this time.

Federal Grain Inspection Service

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $9,706,000
Budget estimate, 1992	13,011,000
House allowance	11,397,000
Committee recommendation	10,557,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $126 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Federal Grain Inspection Service [FGIS] was established on November 20, 1976, to carry out and administer the provisions of the U.S. Grain Standards Act [USGSA] (Public Law 94-582). The mission of FGIS is to provide for the establishment of official U.S. standards for grain and other commodities, to promote the uniform application thereof by official inspection personnel, to provide for an official inspection system for grain, and regulate the weighing and certification of the weight of grain shipped in interstate or foreign commerce as authorized by the USGSA and the regulations thereof; and to carry out the delegated responsibilities under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 [AMA].

The costs of nearly all field services and most headquarters activities are financed from fees charged for services performed. Compliance and standardization activities, international monitoring, and the FGIS Advisory Committee are financed from appropriations. The Grain Quality Improvement Act of 1986 was enacted on November 10, 1986, to improve the quality of U.S. grain by prohibiting the introduction and reintroduction of dockage and foreign material to grain.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Federal Grain Inspection Service, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,557,000. This amount is $851,000 more than the amount provided in 1991, $2,454,000 less than the budget request, and $840,000 less than the House level.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES

Limitation, 1991	$37,164,000
Budget estimate, 1992	40,176,000
House allowance	39,383,000
Committee recommendation	40,176,000

The Federal Grain Inspection Service provides an official grain inspection and weighing system under the U.S. Grain Standards Act [USGSA], and official inspection of rice and grain related products under the Agricultural Marketing Act [AMA] of 1946. The USGSA was amended in 1981 to require the collection of user fees to fund the costs associated with the operation, supervision, and administration of Federal grain inspection and weighing activities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation of $40,176,000 on the obligation of funds collected through user fees. The limitation is $3,012,000 more than the 1991 level, the same as the budget estimate, and $793,000 more than the House level.

The Committee concurs with House bill language granting authority to exceed the limitation on inspection and weighing services by 10 percent with notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $4,864,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,140,000
House allowance	5,640,000
Committee recommendation	5,140,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $63 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Agricultural Cooperative Service [ACS] is assigned functions under both the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926 and functions that relate to the economic and marketing aspects of farmer cooperatives under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. Under the Cooperative Marketing Act, ACS is authorized to: (1) acquire, analyze and disseminate economic, statistical, and historical information regarding the progress, organization, and business methods of cooperative associations in the United States and foreign countries; (2) conduct studies of the economic, legal, financial, social, and other phases of cooperation, including analyses of the organization, operation, financial, and merchandising problems of cooperative associations; (3) make surveys and analyses of the accounts and business practices of representative cooperative associations; (4) confer and advise producers who want to form a cooperative association and make economic analyses of facts relevant to establishing such an association; (5) promote knowledge about cooperative principles and practices; and (6) acquire and disseminate such information.

Under the Agricultural Marketing Act, ACS is authorized to carry out responsibilities relating to the marketing aspects of cooperatives, including economic research and analysis and the application of economic research findings. In addition, ACS is authorized to work with institutions and international organizations and to conduct research to aid new and existing cooperatives.

ACS serves as the focal point of national activity involving agricultural cooperatives. The purpose of ACS is to help farmers help themselves by providing the assistance necessary to support and improve existing cooperatives and to help farmers organize new cooperatives. The studies conducted by ACS, alone or in conjunction with other Federal or State institutions, are intended to provide farmers with information on economic, financial, organizational, legal, and social aspects of cooperative activity.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,140,000 for the Agricultural Cooperative Service. This amount is $276,000 above the amount provided in 1991, the same as the budget estimate, and $500,000 less than the House level.

The Committee has maintained bill language that earmarks $99,000 for a field office in Hawaii.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

The Agricultural Marketing Service [AMS] was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on April 2, 1972. AMS carries out programs authorized by some 31 different statutory authorities, the primary ones being the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627); the U.S. Cotton Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 51-65); the Cotton Statistics and Estimates Act (7 U.S.C. 471-476); the Tobacco Inspection Act (7 U.S.C. 511-511q); the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (7 U.S.C. 499a-499s); the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031-1056); and section 32 (15 U.S.C. 713c).

The primary objective of AMS is to enhance the marketing, distribution, and transportation of agricultural products from the Nation's farms. This is achieved through the collection and dissemination of market news information, the establishment of grading standards, inspection and grading services, transportation services, and various marketing development programs. Approximately three-fourths of the funds needed to finance these activities are derived through user fees.

The Agricultural Marketing Service administers the following programs: Market news service; inspection, grading, and standardization services; market protection and promotion activities; wholesale market development; transportation services; Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program; Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act; and strengthening markets, income, and supply (section 32). The AMS also provides program-related services for Federal, State, and private agencies on a reimbursable basis.

MARKETING SERVICES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] [2] $50,343,000
Budget estimate, 1992	68,333,000
House allowance	56,636,000
Committee recommendation	42,066,000

[1] Includes $2,429,000 for the Office of Transportation.
[2] Does not reflect sequester of $655 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For marketing services, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $42,066,000. This amount is $8,277,000 less than the amount provided in 1991, $26,267,000 less than the budget estimate, and $14,570,000 less than the House level.

The Committee concurs with the House in providing funding for the third and final year of the Chicago wholesale food industry study. An amount of $250,000 was provided in 1991. The Committee does not concur with the House in providing $250,000 for developing and expanding the Toledo, OH, farmers' market direct marketing.

The Committee recommendation does not include funds for the Pesticide Data Collection Program begun in 1991 and has reduced the appropriation by $11,862,000, the amount provided in 1991.

Regarding the cosmetic appearance of agricultural commodities, the Committee concurs with the House in requesting a report from the Agricultural Marketing Service on the need for additional research on whether grade standards and other regulations governing cosmetic appearance affect pesticide use in the production of perishable commodities.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 1991	[1] $40,162,000
Budget estimate, 1992	50,735,000
House allowance	50,735,000
Committee recommendation	50,735,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $522 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35) initiated a system of user fees for the cost of grading and classing tobacco, cotton, naval stores, and for warehouse examination. These activities, authorized under the U.S. Cotton Standards Act, the Tobacco Inspection Act, the Naval Stores Act, the U.S. Warehouse Act, and other provisions of law are designed to facilitate commerce and to protect participants in the industry.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations from user fees for these activities of $50,735,000. This amount is $10,573,000 more than last year's level and the same as the House level and the budget request.

The Committee concurs with House bill language granting authority to exceed the limitation on administrative expenses by 10 percent with notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY
(SECTION 32)

(BY TRANSFER)

Appropriations, 1991	$8,255,000
Budget estimate, 1992	10,360,000
House allowance	10,360,000
Committee recommendation	10,360,000

Under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), an amount equal to 30 percent of customs receipts collected during each preceding calendar year and unused balances up to $300,000,000 are available for encouraging the domestic consumption and exportation of agricultural commodities. An amount equal to 30 percent of receipts collected on fishery products is transferred to the Department of Commerce. Additional transfers to the child nutrition programs of the Food and Nutrition Service have been provided in recent appropriation acts.

The section 32 program administered by the Agricultural Marketing Service consists of commodity purchases for the removal of surplus agricultural products and the subsequent donation of these products to domestic feeding programs; the administration of commodity contracting in the commodity purchase services activity; and the administration of marketing agreements and orders.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a transfer from section 32 funds of $10,360,000 for the formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders. This amount is the same as the House level, $2,105,000 more than the 1991 transfer, and the same as the budget request.

The Committee recommends bill language providing for continuation of the Sunflower and Cottonseed Oil Assistance Programs using section 32 funds as authorized by law.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $1,250,000
Budget estimate, 1992	980,000
House allowance	1,250,000
Committee recommendation	1,250,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $16 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program is authorized by section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, in which cooperative agreements are authorized between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and State departments of agriculture or similar State agencies. Beginning in fiscal year 1980, those projects funded were coordinated with the Wholesale Market Development Program. These agreements make possible joint Federal/State projects aimed at improving the efficiency of the agricultural marketing chain. The States contribute at least half of the cost of such projects. The work is performed either by State personnel or is contracted out to private industry.

Payments are made to State marketing agencies to assist in testing new marketing innovations to reduce the cost of marketing and seek means for providing more reliable market information, developing better quality commodity grading standards, and developing additional domestic and foreign market outlets. This program has covered such projects as: electronic marketing, telephone auction systems, maintaining and improving the quality of products, reducing marketing costs, expanding outlets for products, collecting and disseminating special State and local market information and sta-

tistics, and improving the organizational structure of the marketing system.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee provides $1,250,000 for payments to States and possessions for Federal-State marketing projects. This is the same amount proposed by the House and the 1991 level and $270,000 above the budget request.

The North Dakota Agricultural Products Utilization Commission has developed a proposal for identifying and market testing alternative farm commodities, determining methods of providing more reliable market information, improving marketing efficiency and effectiveness, seeking new outlets for existing farm produced commodities, and establishing cooperatives and marketing training programs. The Committee expects up to $250,000 of these funds to be made available, on a matching basis, to the North Dakota Department of Agriculture for this purpose.

APPROPRIATIONS TO TRUST FUNDS

Appropriations, 1991	.....
Budget estimate, 1992	$2,625,000
House allowance	1,650,000
Committee recommendation	600,000

The dairy grading program provides fee-supported grading services to the dairy industry and the Government. Recent legislative changes, such as the dairy whole-herd buyout, as well as a greatly reduced need for price supports, caused a decrease in the amount of dairy products requiring grading. As a result, the dairy grading program experienced a sudden and severe decline in revenues. The program depleted its operating reserve and accumulated a deficit. The 1992 budget includes $1,250,000 to eliminate the dairy grading program accumulated deficit. Also, the 1992 budget includes $1,375,000 to implement the National Laboratory Accreditation Program authorized by the FACT Act. This program would verify that these laboratories meet minimum quality and reliability standards.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For appropriations to trust funds, the Committee recommends $600,000. This amount is $1,050,000 less than the House amount and $2,025,000 less than the budget request. There was no similar account in 1991.

The Committee concurs with the House in providing $400,000 for the capitalization of the APHIS laboratory in Gulfport, MS, to provide the testing services necessary to support the National Laboratory Accreditation Program. An additional $200,000 is provided for the development, promulgation, and implementation of AMS program operating rules and regulations. No funds are provided to recapitalize the Dairy Grading Program.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $10,687,000
Budget estimate, 1992	11,359,000
House allowance	12,009,000
Committee recommendation	11,859,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $139 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The Packers and Stockyards Administration [P&SA] was reestablished by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1000–1, of June 17, 1981, and administers the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. The agency carries out the Secretary's responsibilities under section 1324 of the Food Security Act of 1985 covering central filing systems established by States for prenotification of security interests against farm products. The agency also has responsibility for persons and firms subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act for the Truth-in-Lending Act, the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and Freedom of Information Act.

The principal purpose of the Packers and Stockyards Administration programs is to assure the integrity of the livestock, meat, and poultry markets and the marketplace. This includes fostering fair and open competition and guarding against deceptive and fraudulent practices which affect the movement and price of meat animals and the products therefrom. The work of the agency is also aimed at protecting consumers and members of the livestock, meat, and poultry industries against unfair business practices which can unduly affect meat and poultry distribution and prices.

The Food Security Act of 1985 permits the States to establish central filing systems for the purpose of prenotifying buyers, commission merchants, and seller agents of security interests against farm products. It is the responsibility of the Packers and Stockyards Administration to issue regulations and to certify those systems which meet the criteria set forth in the statute.

In 1987 the Packers and Stockyards Act was amended to provide financial protection to poultry growers and sellers, and to clarify Federal jurisdiction under the act. The act is cited as the Poultry Producers Financial Protection Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–173).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Packers and Stockyards Administration, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,859,000, $1,172,000 more than the 1991 level, $500,000 more than the budget estimate, and $150,000 less than the House level.

The Committee concurs with the House in requesting a study and report on concentration in the red meat packing industry. The Committee is not sure that this effort should last 3 years, as proposed by the House, and expects the Department to propose a plan. The Committee recommends $500,000 for this effort, $150,000 less than the House, and expects that not less than $250,000 of this amount will be used to contract with other organizations and universities.

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $506,000
Budget estimate, 1992	740,000
House allowance	551,000
Committee recommendation	531,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $7 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs administers the laws enacted by the Congress for the Foreign Agricultural Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Office of International Cooperation and Development.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $531,000. This amount is $25,000 more than the 1991 level, $209,000 less than the budget request, and $20,000 less than the House level.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on June 5, 1961, under the authority of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 901-913). The warehouse examination function was transferred from the Agricultural Marketing Service to ASCS under Secretary's Memorandum 1020-15, effective May 13, 1984. The U.S. Warehouse Act (7 U.S.C. 241-273) is the legislative authority for this program. The Food Security Act of 1985, enacted on December 23, 1985, provided for changes to several existing programs and required the implementation of many new programs, primarily those operated through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (FACT Act), enacted on November 28, 1990, extended and revised existing programs and provided several new programs.

The ASCS conducts its programs in the field through a number of offices. Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation State and county committees are responsible for local administration of a variety of programs dealing directly with the farmer. Through the farmer-elected agricultural stabilization and conservation [ASC] county committees, ASCS also obtains recommendations and advice in the formulation of program plans and policies. There are 50 ASC State committees, an ASC committee in Puerto Rico, and 3,054 county committees. The Washington headquarters offices and the Kansas City field offices are the principal staff offices for carrying out activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC]. Such functions include accounting for loans and purchases; acquisition, management, storage, and disposition of commodities; and related transportation and accounting activities.

ASCS licenses warehouses and performs inspections of these facilities, for a fee, to reduce the risk of financial loss to depositors storing commodities at licensed facilities. Inspections are also performed on nonlicensed facilities that have storage contracts with CCC for commodities owned by or pledged as collateral to CCC.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriation	Transfer from CCC	Transfer from program accounts	Total
Allotment, 1991	$46,900,000	$630,406,000		[1] $677,306,000
Budget estimate, 1992		769,736,000	$1,162,000	770,898,000
House allowance	719,289,000		1,162,000	720,451,000
Committee recommendation		719,289,000	1,147,000	720,436,000

[1] Includes direct appropriation of $46,900,000 provided by Public Law 102-27 of which $610 is sequestered pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The account "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service," funds the administrative expenses of program administration and other functions assigned to ASCS. The funds consist of transfers from the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] and the CCC loans and Public Law 480 program accounts, and miscellaneous advances from other sources. These transfers consolidate all administrative funds used by ASCS into one account. The consolidation provides clarity and better management and control of funds, and facilitates accounting, fiscal, and budgetary work by eliminating the necessity for making individual allocations and allotments and maintaining and recording obligations and expenditures under numerous separate accounts.

Activities carried out under this program include program formulation and appraisal; operation of supply adjustment, conservation, and price support programs; inventory management and merchandising; and warehouse examination.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Committee recommends total funds of $720,436,000. This amount is $43,130,000 more than the 1991 amount, $15,000 less than the House level, and $50,462,000 less than the budget request. Of the total, the Committee recommends $719,289,000 by transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation, while the House provided a direct appropriation in the same amount. Furthermore, $589,000, the same as the House amount, is by transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation "Export loans program" account and $558,000, $15,000 less than the House amount, is by transfer from the "Public Law 480 program" account.

The Committee recommends bill language providing that ASCS shall set up a national appeals division provided for under section 426 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

As discussed later in this report, the Committee does not concur with the House regarding the Wetlands Reserve Program. However, the Committee does concur with the House in requesting additional information on the operation, costs, desirability, and acceptability of the Wetlands Reserve Program.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	$5,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	5,000
Committee recommendation	5,000

Under this program, the Department makes indemnification payments to dairy farmers and manufacturers of dairy products who, through no fault of their own, suffer losses because they are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets due to contamination of their products by registered pesticides. The program also authorizes indemnity payments to dairy farmers for losses resulting from the removal of cows or dairy products from the market due to nuclear radiation or fallout.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Dairy Indemnity Program, the Committee recommends $5,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 and House levels. No funds were requested in the President's budget.

CORPORATIONS

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] [2] $325,857,000
Budget estimate, 1992	322,870,000
House allowance	322,870,000
Committee recommendation	322,870,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $4,236 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

[2] The 1991 appropriations act appropriated such sums as necessary for administrative and operating expenses. The sum of $325,857,000 is an estimate of the amount to be spent.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation [FCIC], a wholly owned Government corporation, was created on February 16, 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1501-1520), to carry out the provisions of the Federal Crop Insurance Act. The purpose of the Corporation is to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation provides a cost-sharing insurance program for agricultural producers to protect their production investment against unavoidable risks. The crop insurance program constitutes a joint effort by the private insurance industry and the Government. The private insurance companies and agents are being utilized in the delivery of the program to the farmers.

The Federal Crop Insurance Program comprises the following major activities: (1) underwriting, actuarial, and program development which consists of the development of crop insurance programs and the establishment and maintenance of rates and coverages for crops in each county; (2) reinsured companies, which covers the insurance companies' costs of insurance marketing, distribution, servicing, training, quality control, and loss adjustment functions. The companies also share with FCIC, to a limited extent, both profits and losses; (3) agency sales and service agreements and loss adjustment contracts consist of what is commonly referred to

as master marketing agreements and the loss adjustment contracts associated with direct insurance operations. Under this type of agreement, private insurance companies and associations are offered the opportunity to contract with FCIC to provide insurance sales and services. Also included are amounts necessary for the loss adjustment activities contracted by FCIC, which are associated with these contracts; (4) compliance consists of reviews of the activities of the reinsured companies to assure compliance and uniformity in loss adjustment procedures, training development, quality control methods utilized and, in general, all service operating facets of the crop insurance program; (5) program management and administrative support consists of the contract administration and marketing for the dual delivery system of crop insurance as well as administrative support in financial, management services, and personnel management for FCIC.

The various crop insurance programs are planned, developed, and monitored by the FCIC headquarters office located in Washington, DC, and its national operations office located in Kansas City, MO. The program is administered in the field through 16 field service offices and 11 field underwriting offices. Selling and servicing at the county level is performed primarily by agents operating under agency sales and service agreements (master marketing agreements) and agents of reinsured companies. The adjustment of losses is performed primarily by independent claims adjusters under contract with FCIC and by reinsured companies. Also, ASCS performs some support on a reimbursable basis for the Corporation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For administrative and operating expenses of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $322,870,000. This amount is $2,987,000 less than the amount estimated for in 1991 and the same as the budget estimate and the House level.

The Committee is aware that FCIC and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service are continuing discussions on options for responding to the House directive that the crop insurance program should be returned to the control of ASCS so far as sales and loss adjustments are concerned. The Committee expects that the authorizing legislation will be followed as changes are considered and implemented. Furthermore, the Committee notes that FCIC plans to evaluate performance under the new standard reinsurance agreement and take any actions necessary to maintain a cost-effective relationship with the reinsurance companies that participate in the program.

Regarding the actuarial soundness of the program, FCIC has implemented a system that identifies policyholders with high claims frequency and above average loss history which are beyond published criteria. These policyholders are being moved to a nonstandard classification, with adjustments made to their premium rates and coverage consistent with the risk these policyholders pose to the program. Further, the agency has completed a requirement of the 1990 farm bill to compile data by region and crop on the premi-

um rates that would be necessary to achieve actuarial soundness. The Committee expects that abnormal weather conditions over an extended period of time, such as has occurred with regard to drought, floods, et cetera, either exclusively or in combination, will not be a factor in determining crop insurance rates and availability. The purpose of the program is to provide coverage for such abnormal conditions, even if they occur in the same location over successive seasons.

FCIC FUND

Appropriations, 1991	$337,365,000
Budget estimate, 1992	308,782,000
House allowance	221,500,000
Committee recommendation	260,500,000

The Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1980, as amended, authorizes the payment of up to 30 percent of the adjusted insurance premium paid by agricultural producers participating in the program. Subsidies will be paid by the Corporation based upon 30 percent of the risk premium (reduced, where applicable, for hail and fire exclusion) on any coverage under the Corporation's policy of insurance of up to a maximum of 65 percent of the recorded or appraised yield, encouraging the broadest possible participation of agricultural producers in the program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the FCIC fund, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $260,500,000 which is $76,865,000 less than the amount available in 1991, $39,000,000 more than the House level, and $48,282,000 less than the budget request.

The budget estimated that $87,282,000 in reimbursements to the revolving fund would be needed for administrative expenses. The House did not provide this amount. Because the 1991 appropriation for administrative and operating expenses provided such sums as necessary, approximately $48,000,000 can be paid through that appropriation. However, the remaining $39,000,000 of the requested prior-year reimbursement represents 1989 and 1990 expenses. Therefore, the Committee has provided an increase of $39,000,000 over the House level.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] is a wholly owned Government corporation created in 1933 to stabilize, support, and protect farm income and prices; to help maintain balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, including products, foods, feeds, and fibers; and to help in the orderly distribution of these commodities. CCC was originally incorporated under a Delaware charter and was reincorporated June 30, 1948, as a Federal corporation within the Department of Agriculture by the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, approved June 29, 1948 (15 U.S.C. 714).

The principal operations conducted by CCC are support programs for agricultural commodities, including the storage, handling, and disposition of commodities acquired under the programs; acreage

limitation, loan deficiency, deficiency, disaster, and/or diversion payment programs for feed grains, wheat, rice, and cotton; certificate programs; a conservation reserve program; and special activities, such as those under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, (Public Law 480), which are financed by appropriations authorized by statutes providing for these activities. Under the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended, CCC may finance short-term export sales on credit terms not to exceed 3 years, and intermediate-term export credit sales in excess of 3 years, but not more than 10 years. The Corporation is also authorized under its charter and the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended, to enter into export guarantee financing arrangements with respect to exported commodities. In 1992, there are new credit reform procedures for Federal credit programs authorized by the Balanced Budget Act of 1990, title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990. These procedures require that budget authority and outlays for these programs represent subsidy costs (including interest subsidies) and administrative expenses, rather than claim disbursements and repayments.

Management of the Corporation is vested in a board of directors, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is an ex-officio director and chairman of the board. The board consists of seven members, in addition to the Secretary, who are appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. Officers of the Corporation are designated according to their positions in the Department of Agriculture.

The activities of the Corporation are carried out mainly by the personnel and through the facilities of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation [ASC] State and county committees. The Foreign Agricultural Service, the General Sales Manager, other agencies and offices of the Department, and commercial agents are also used to carry out certain phases of the Corporation's activities.

The Corporation's capital stock of $100,000,000 is held by the United States. Under present law up to $30,000,000,000 may be borrowed from the U.S. Treasury, from private lending agencies, and from others, at any one time. The Corporation reserves a sufficient amount of its borrowing authority to purchase at any time all notes and other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies and others. All bonds, notes, debentures, and similar obligations issued by the Corporation are subject to approval by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Under Public Law 87-155 (15 U.S.C. 713a-11, 713a-12), annual appropriations are authorized for each fiscal year, commencing with fiscal year 1961. These appropriations are to reimburse the Corporation for net realized losses.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

Appropriations, 1991	$5,000,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	[1] 9,000,000,000
House allowance	8,450,000,000
Committee recommendation	8,450,000,000

[1] Amount proposed to be reimbursed through a current indefinite appropriation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For reimbursement for net realized losses, the Committee recommends $8,450,000,000. This amount is $3,450,000,000 more than was provided in 1991 and the same as the House level. The budget requested a current indefinite appropriation and estimated that $9,000,000,000 will be necessary to reimburse the Corporation for net realized losses.

The Committee believes that if clean fuels are to play a significant role in the President's clean air initiative, production must increase dramatically in the coming years. The Committee recognizes that the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and the State of Nebraska are conducting studies of the economic advantages of utilizing offgrade, nonfood grain for clean fuel. Iowa State University is examining the ability to use aflotoxin contaminated and other out of condition grain for the production of ethanol. The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Energy should support these programs. Accordingly, these funds shall be used to gather and relocate offgrade grains to approved sites designated by the States of Iowa and Nebraska, and the Louisiana Department of Agriculture. The grain would be sold to facilities engaged in the production of clean fuels. The research should focus on the economic feasibility of relocating the grain as well as using the byproducts for livestock feed. The Commodity Credit Corporation has the authority to use offgrade grain for clean fuel production. The Committee strongly urges that CCC make available not less than 15 million bushels of offgrade grain for this research project to be sold under normal CCC regulations.

The Commodity Credit Corporation will also participate, on a trial basis, in an alternative fuel program by entering into separate agreements with a limited number of qualified unrelated farmer-owned cooperatives, each organized for the sole purpose of constructing and owning a facility for the production of ethanol and related byproducts, to deliver CCC-owned grain, if available, to each cooperative in the event natural disaster or other unforeseen occurrence results in nondelivery of member-owned grain as required under each cooperative's member grain delivery agreement with its members.

Each cooperative shall be obligated to repay the CCC for grain delivered to its cooperative either with in-kind grain or at the CCC acquisition price of the grain delivered, after meeting its own operating needs and debt service, and the cooperative will subordinate any distribution of earnings to cooperative members to the repayment of CCC.

It is expected that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have surplus stocks of nonfat dry milk in inventory during fiscal year 1991. The conferees direct the Secretary to donate available nonfat dry milk to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program and the Food Distribution Program on Indian reservations.

Salmonella enteriditis is a disease affecting egg and poultry production which threatens human health. The problem of salmonella is spreading beyond the Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic States to other parts of the country. Over the last 2 years, the USDA task force on salmonella has been funded through an emergency

$6,000,000 allocation from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Secretary is urged to continue to use his emergency authority to maintain level funding for this task force until the emergency has subsided.

Scrapie.—The Committee believes that eradication of scrapie is of critical importance to the sheep industry and to the entire livestock and meat industry. Concerns about the spread of the disease have caused significant disruptions in the handling and processing of sheep and lamb carcasses and byproducts. In addition, unanswered questions about the relationship of scrapie to bovine spongiform encephalopathy [BSE] threaten additional damage to the livestock and meat industry.

In February 1990, APHIS established a Scrapie Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee involving representatives of the sheep, livestock, and meat industries and farm and veterinary medical groups to develop a proposed new scrapie certification and indemnification program.

The proposed program agreed upon by the Committee includes a voluntary scrapie flock certification program which measures, reports, and certifies the absence of scrapie over a designated time period; a one-time 6-month flock depopulation program with indemnification for infected and source flocks; and regulations to establish the types of identification needed for interstate movement of sheep.

Because the cost of the one-time limited depopulation program, the cost to the Federal Government is highest in the first year of the program but declines significantly in subsequent years. Nevertheless, sheep producers are committed to bearing over 70 percent of the total cost of the program. The Federal Government's share is only 18 percent.

Because of the extreme importance and urgency of eradicating scrapie, the Committee directs the Secretary to spend up to $9,991,200 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or other agencies under the authority provided in section 147(b) of title 7, United States Code, to carry out the program agreed upon by the Scrapie Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management.—The Committee has struck House bill language providing a $5,000,000 limitation on the amount of CCC expenditures for compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The budget requested a limitation of $3,000,000.

GENERAL SALES MANAGER

(BY TRANSFER)

	Transfer from CCC	Transfer from program accounts	Total
Allotment, 1991	$7,803,000	.....	$7,803,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,098,000	$4,005,000	9,103,000
House allowance	5,098,000	4,005,000	9,103,000
Committee recommendation	5,098,000	3,973,000	9,071,000

The General Sales Manager was established pursuant to section 5(f) of the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation and 15 U.S.C. 714–714p. The funds allocated to the General Sales Manager are used for conducting the following programs: (1) CCC Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–102), (2) Intermediate Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–103), (3) Public Law 480, (4) section 416 Overseas Donations Program, (5) Export Enhancement Program, (6) Market Promotion Program, and (7) programs authorized by the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act including barter, export sales of most CCC-owned commodities, export payments, and other programs as assigned to encourage and enhance the export of U.S. agricultural commodities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the General Sales Manager, the Committee recommends a total budget of $9,071,000. Included is the transfer of $5,098,000, the same amount as the House and budget request, from the Commodity Credit Corporation. In addition, $2,731,000 is transferred from the CCC "Export loans program" account and $1,242,000 from the "Public Law 480 program" account. The House transferred $2,731,000 and $1,274,000 respectively.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $520,000
Budget estimate, 1992	563,000
House allowance	563,000
Committee recommendation	543,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $7 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to natural resources and environment. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $543,000. This amount is $23,000 more than the 1991 level, and $20,000 less than both the budget request and the House level.

Soil Conservation Service

The Soil Conservation Service [SCS] was established by Public Law 74-46 on April 27, 1935, (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) to carry out a continuing program of soil and water conservation on the private lands of the Nation. The current mission of the agency is to provide national leadership in the conservation and wise use of soil, water, and related resources through a balanced cooperative program that protects, restores, and improves those resources.

The conservation activities of the Soil Conservation Service are guided by the priorities and objectives as set forth in the National Conservation Program [NCP] which was prepared in response to the provisions of the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 [RCA] (Public Law 95-192) and transmitted to the Congress in December 1982. The long-term objectives of the program are designed to maintain and improve the soil, water, and related resources of the Nation's nonpublic lands by: reducing excessive soil erosion; improving irrigation efficiencies; improving water management; reducing upstream flood damages; improving range condition; and improving water quality.

The program establishes national priorities to guide USDA conservation activities over the next 5 years. The first priority is to reduce excessive soil erosion on agricultural lands. The second priority is twofold: to conserve water used in agriculture, and to reduce flood damages in upstream areas.

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $509,056,000
Budget estimate, 1992	588,604,000
House allowance	564,129,000
Committee recommendation	564,129,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $6,624 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

Conservation operations is authorized by Public Law 74-46, (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f). Activities include:

Conservation technical assistance.—Provides assistance to district cooperators and other land users in the planning and application of conservation treatments to control erosion and improve the quantity and quality of soil resources, improve and conserve water, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, conserve energy, improve woodland, pasture and range conditions, and reduce upstream flooding; all to protect and enhance the natural resource base.

Inventory and monitoring provides soil, water, and related resource data for land conservation, use, and development; guidance of community development; identification of prime agricultural producing areas that should be protected; use in protecting the quality of the environment; and to issue periodic inventory reports of resource conditions.

Resource appraisal and program development ensures that programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture for the conservation of soil, water, and related resources shall respond to the Nation's long-term needs. This activity is authorized by the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act, Public Law 95-192, November 18, 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2001), as amended by the Food Security Act of 1985, Public Law 99-198.

Soil surveys.—Inventories the Nation's basic soil resources and determines land capabilities and conservation treatment needs. Soil survey publications include interpretations useful to cooperators, other Federal agencies, State and local organizations.

Snow survey and water forecasting.—Provides estimates of annual water availability from high mountain snow packs and relates this to summer stream flow in the Western States and Alaska. Information is used by agriculture, industry, and cities in estimating future water supplies.

Plant materials centers.—Assembles, tests, and encourages increased use of plant species which show promise for use in the treatment of conservation problem areas.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For conservation operations, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $564,129,000. This amount is $55,073,000 more than the 1991 level, $24,475,000 less than the budget estimate, and the same as the House level.

Included in this amount is $4,500,000, the same as the 1991 level, for the Chesapeake Bay program. This amount will support no fewer than 62 staff positions for this project and will enhance automation systems in the bay area.

The Committee recommends $490,000, the same as the 1991 level, for continuation of the North Dakota centennial windbreak project as proposed by the North Dakota Extension Service.

SCS is directed to continue its active role in the vital Rural Abandoned Mines Program [RAMP].

The appropriation includes $176,000, the same as in 1991, for continuation of the joint effort by Alcorn State University in Mississippi and SCS to study alternative conservation practices on small farms where traditional measures are not practicable.

A total of $100,000, the same as the 1991 amount, is included to continue the work on the problem of sedimentation in Red Rock Reservoir in Iowa.

Not less than $75,000, the same as the amount provided in 1991, is available for the Louisiana State University rice research station to fund plant biotechnology work.

In addition to the amount normally allocated for the State of Arkansas, the Committee concurs with the House by including $452,000, the same as in 1991, to continue the 26-county eastern Arkansas water conservation study. In addition, the Committee expects the Plant Material Center at Booneville, AR, to be fully funded at a level not less than in 1991.

The Committee provides $250,000 to support agricultural development on the island of Molokai, HI. These funds will be used to begin implementation of a master plan called for by this Committee last year to stimulate agricultural development in this predominantly native Hawaiian community. Part of this effort will be to provide a cost-sharing program for irrigation facilities on lands not previously irrigated. This program will be operated in unison with the Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Service's Agricultural Conservation Program.

The loess hills is a nearly unique type of soil that only exist in western Iowa and China. It is a very fine silty soil that is excellent for certain types of crops, but it is very erodible. The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 for a pilot program to develop the techniques to deal with this serious erosion problem and to work on several specific sites in western Iowa.

The Committee concurs with the House in requesting a report on plant materials centers. This report should include information on requests for new plant materials centers, such as the one proposed in conjunction with Virginia State University, as well as the need for increased funding for existing centers, such as the center at Golden Meadow, LA.

The Committee does not concur with the House in providing an increase of $525,000 for the Michigan subirrigation study or in providing $200,000 to complete the multipurpose land information system cooperative project with the city of Northport, AL.

The Committee recommends bill language providing authority for the Soil Conservation Service to expend funds acquired in a 1982 land transfer for the construction of a plant materials research center in Skagit County, WA. The amount of funds expended may not exceed the amount of money received from the exchange of lands in Skagit County and Bellingham, WA.

RIVER BASIN SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $12,783,000
Budget estimate, 1992	10,982,000
House allowance	13,251,000
Committee recommendation	13,251,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $166 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

This program is authorized by the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 83-566, section 6, August 4, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1006-1009).

The Soil Conservation Service administers a program which involves cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies in making surveys and investigations of watersheds of rivers and other waterways as a basis for the development of coordinated water resource programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For River basin surveys and investigations, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $13,251,000. This amount is $468,000 more than the 1991 level, $2,269,000 more than the budget request, and the same as the House level.

WATERSHED PLANNING

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $9,176,000
Budget estimate, 1992	7,291,000
House allowance	9,545,000
Committee recommendation	9,545,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $119 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Department cooperates with the States and other agencies in planning works of improvement in small watersheds to reduce damage from floodwater, sediment, and erosion and for the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, as authorized by the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, Public Law 83-566, August 4, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1001-1008).

The Department makes surveys of proposed small watershed projects, and prepares work plans in cooperation with local sponsors. These plans outline the soil and water management problems in the watershed, the steps that have been or are authorized to be taken to alleviate these problems, the proposed works of improvement to be installed, the estimated benefits and costs, the cost sharing and operation and maintenance arrangements, and other facts necessary to justify Federal participation in project development.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For watershed planning, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $9,545,000. This amount is $369,000 more than the 1991 level, $2,254,000 more than the budget estimate, and the same as the House level.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $185,705,000
Budget estimate, 1992	152,961,000
House allowance	205,238,000
Committee recommendation	205,266,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $2,414 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The appropriation "Watershed and flood prevention operations" funds those activities authorized by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1005, 1007-1009) and the Flood Control Act, as amended and supplemented (33 U.S.C. 701, 16 U.S.C. 1006a) and sections 403-405 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2203-2205), which relate to installation of individual watershed projects, flood prevention subwatershed projects, and emergency watershed protection.

The Soil Conservation Service has general responsibility for administration of activities which include cooperation with local sponsors, State, and other public agencies in the installation of planned works of improvement to reduce erosion, floodwater, and sediment damage; conserve, develop, utilize, and dispose of water; plan and install works of improvement for flood prevention including the development of recreational facilities and the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat; and loans to local organizations to help finance the local share of the cost of carrying out planned watershed and flood prevention works of improvement as authorized by Public Law 566, Public Law 534, and section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950. The Farmers Home Administration administers the loan program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For watershed and flood prevention operations, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $205,266,000. This amount is $19,561,000 more than the 1991 amount, $52,305,000 more than the budget estimate, and $28,000 more than the House provision.

For operations authorized by Public Law 534, the Committee recommends $36,091,000, which is $9,325,000 above the 1991 level, $6,000,000 above the House allotment, and $15,691,000 above the budget request. Of the increase, $9,000,000 is provided for the construction of North and South Mill Creek Dam No. 7 in West Virginia. The Committee expects that the Little Sioux, IA, project will receive no less Public Law 534 funding than the 1990 funding level.

For the emergency conservation program, $20,028,000 is recommended, which is an increase of $28,000 above the 1991 level, $9,972,000 less than the House amount, and $10,028,000 more than the budget request. Bill language has been included amending the authority for this program to include the wind erosion and drought sections of the statute.

The Committee is aware of damage caused by heavy spring rains to the Potomac River Basin and Fourpole Creek near Huntington, WV. Both of these areas have suffered damaging stream bank erosion which poses a threat to property and lives. For repairing this damage, $3,500,000 is included. Also included in the amount available for emergency conservation activities is $3,500,000 to repair damages due to storms in 1990 and 1991 in the counties of Prentiss,

Lowndes, Yazoo, Tate, Hinds, Lee, Coahoma, Adams, Walthall, Rankin, Neshoba, Winston, Claiborne, Attala, Leake, Warren, Alcorn, and Newton. The Committee recognizes that this amount is not sufficient to repair all erosion damage in these counties in Mississippi; however, it urges SCS to perform emergency work on a priority basis.

The Committee recommends $149,147,000 for small watersheds authorized by Public Law 566. This amount is an increase of $10,208,000 to the 1991 level, $4,000,000 more than the House provided and $26,586,000 more than the budget request. Of the increase, $9,000,000 is provided for the construction of Howard Creek Dam No. 12 in West Virginia.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $29,900,000
Budget estimate, 1992	23,631,000
House allowance	32,516,000
Committee recommendation	31,236,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $389 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Resource Conservation and Development [RC&D] Program began in February 1964 under authority of section 102 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-703) and other departmental authorities. In December 1981, sections 3451-3461 of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 authorized a program for aiding local and State efforts in resource conservation and development. Program assistance is provided to RC&D sponsors as authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture. RC&D sponsors, State and local units of government, and nonprofit organizations initiate and direct the planning process, develop and maintain an RC&D area plan, and carry out activities to implement the plan.

USDA provides technical, financial, and loan assistance to local sponsors. An RC&D Policy Board was established in April 1984 under subtitle H of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-98). The Board provides advice and recommends policy on program administration to the Secretary of Agriculture. The interagency board has members from the Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, Farmers Home Administration, Extension Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and the Office of the Secretary. Program leadership is provided by the Soil Conservation Service [SCS]. Sponsors also seek the help of local, State, and other Federal agencies that can assist them in areawide planning and in carrying out activities to implement plans.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Resource Conservation and Development Program, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $31,236,000. This amount is $1,336,000 more than the 1991 level, $7,605,000 more than the budget estimate, and $1,280,000 less than the House level.

The Committee recommendation includes an increase of not less than $220,000 for the establishment of additional RC&D areas in North Dakota. The Committee does not concur with the House in providing an increase of $100,000 for the Laurel Ridge project of the southern Alleghenies RC&D.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $24,637,000
Budget estimate, 1992	25,271,000
House allowance	25,271,000
Committee recommendation	25,271,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $320 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Great Plains Conservation Program is authorized by Public Law 84-1021, as amended, (16 U.S.C. 590p(b)). The program's objective is to bring about a long-term solution to problems resulting from drought and the cultivation of land unsuited for sustained crop production in the 10 Great Plains States.

It is designed to provide needed protection and improvement of soil, water, plant, and wildlife resources of the unique Plains area, which is plagued with recurring drought and wind erosion problems. Selection of suitable land uses and installation of complete conservation treatment and management systems on farms and ranches in the area are made through reduction of wind and water erosion, abatement of agriculture-related pollution and water conservation measures.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Great Plains Conservation Program, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $25,271,000. This amount is $634,000 more than the 1991 level, and the same as the House amount and budget request.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $190,152,000
Budget estimate, 1992	183,024,000
House allowance	194,435,000
Committee recommendation	193,652,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $2,472 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Agricultural Conservation Program [ACP] is authorized by sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (Public Law 74-46), sections 1001-1004, 1006-1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-524), as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-86), section 1501 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-113), and section 259 of the Energy Security Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-294).

The ACP is administered by ASCS through the farmer-elected committee system. The program is a joint effort by Government and landowners to restore and protect basic land and water resources. Objectives include helping to ensure a continuous, adequate supply of food and fiber; improving water quality in rural America; facilitating resource management systems; and achieving national priorities reflected in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and related legislation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Agricultural Conservation Program, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $193,652,000. This amount is $3,500,000 more than the 1991 level, $10,628,000 more than the budget request, and $783,000 less than the House level.

The Committee has increased the 1991 level by $3,500,000 to provide this amount for the water quality incentive program. This amount was provided by the House under a separate appropriation. The President requested $5,000,000 under this account.

The Committee is aware that the Department currently will not accept fertilizer management plans prepared by fertilizer dealers for the water quality incentive program due to conflict of interest concerns. The Committee believes such plans should not be excluded from cost-share or incentive programs, but should be approved by the Soil Conservation Service in accordance with best management practices.

The Committee notes the importance of the Lake Champlain basin special water quality projects in Vermont which have received special ACP funds and provides $2,000,000 for these projects.

The Committee has included bill language allowing ASCS to use existing ACP funds to share irrigation system connection costs (including water meters, connecting pipe, and other installation charges) incurred by Hawaiian Home Land Homesteaders operating lands having a history of irrigation.

The Committee is aware that ASCS has approved poultry compost facilities as technology eligible for cost share through ACP. The Committee urges ASCS to modify the ACP production history requirement to allow poultry-producer eligibility for cost-share assistance in the construction of poultry compost facilities if they have been in continuous operation since the date such facilities were designated an approved technology for cost share.

WATER QUALITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	.....
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	$3,500,000
Committee recommendation	.....

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has recommended funding for the water quality incentive program under the Agricultural Conservation Program of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

FORESTRY INCENTIVES PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $12,446,000
Budget estimate, 1992	12,446,000
House allowance	12,446,000
Committee recommendation	12,446,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $162 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Forestry Incentives Program [FIP] is authorized by section 4 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103) as amended by section 1214, title XII, of the Food Agriculture, Con-

servation, and Trade Act of 1990. Its objectives are to increase the Nation's production of sawtimber and pulpwood on nonindustrial private forest lands, to decrease, over time, expected shortages and rising prices of timber, and to help ensure effective use of available forest lands. Program objectives are met by providing cost share and technical assistance to landowners to encourage voluntary installation of forestry practices. The program shares up to 65 percent of the cost incurred by the landowner for tree planting and timber stand improvement.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Forestry Incentives Program for fiscal year 1992, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,446,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 appropriation, the budget request, and the House level.

WATER BANK PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $13,620,000
Budget estimate, 1992	10,935,000
House allowance	18,620,000
Committee recommendation	18,620,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $177 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Water Bank Program is authorized by the Water Bank Act, Public Law 91-559, approved December 19, 1970, and amended by Public Law 96-182, approved January 2, 1980. Its objectives are to conserve surface water; preserve and improve migratory waterfowl and wildlife-related resources; reduce runoff, soil, and wind erosion; improve flood control; contribute to improved soil moisture; reduce the acreage of land brought into agricultural production; retire land now in production; enhance landscape aesthetics; and promote comprehensive water management planning.

The Secretary enters into agreements with landowners and operators for the conservation of specified wetlands. The agreements are for 10 years with provision for renewal for additional periods. During the period of the agreement, the landowner agrees not to drain, burn, fill or otherwise destroy the wetland character of such areas. The Secretary makes annual payments to the owner or operator at a rate determined at the time of agreement and subject to review after 4 years and at the time of renewal.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Water Bank Program, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $18,620,000. This amount is $5,000,000 more than the 1991 level, $7,685,000 more than the budget estimate, and the same as the House level.

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $10,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $130 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The appropriation "Emergency Conservation Program" of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service funds the activities authorized by the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-334). Under the program the Government shares the cost of carrying out approved practices to assist and encourage farmers to rehabilitate farmland damaged by natural disasters.

Assistance is made available to correct new conservation problems which (1) if not treated will impair or endanger the land, (2) materially affect the productive capacity of the land, (3) represent damage which is unusual in character and except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area, and (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Emergency Conservation Program [ECP], the Committee recommends no appropriation. The House provided $10,000,000, the same as was provided in 1991.

The Committee notes the movement of an emergency supplemental appropriations bill through Congress for 1991 and believes that such an appropriations bill is the more appropriate bill for this funding. The Committee will expect a quarterly report from the Department on the requests and need for funding under this account.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $14,783,000
Budget estimate, 1992	14,783,000
House allowance	14,783,000
Committee recommendation	14,783,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $192 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program was established by section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-320). The program is a cooperative endeavor by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS], Soil Conservation Service [SCS], and Extension Service [ES]. The program is to assist landowners and others in the Colorado River Basin in establishing on-farm irrigation management systems and related lateral improvement measures to decrease the salt load and sedimentation level in the Colorado River and to enhance the supply and quality of water available for use in the United States and the Republic of Mexico.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program, the Committee recommends $14,783,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 level, the budget request, and the House level.

Of the amount provided, $2,500,000 is to be made available for the Moapa Valley Colorado River salinity control project in Moapa Valley, NV.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	$1,314,926,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,642,760,000
House allowance	1,642,760,000
Committee recommendation	1,611,277,000

The Conservation Reserve Program [CRP] was mandated by sections 1231–1245 of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended by sections 1411–1499 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (FACT Act) to establish permanent cover on highly erodible cropland and on cropland posing environmental threats. The primary objectives of the CRP are to help farmers control critical soil erosion that occurs on about one-third of America's cropland and to decrease production of some surplus agricultural commodities, enhance water quality, and improve wildlife habitat.

The CRP is authorized in all 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands on all cropland meeting the eligibility criteria in the years 1991–95. Up to 44 million acres of eligible cropland may be entered into the reserve.

The program is administered by State and local ASC committees working under the general direction of ASCS. Technical assistance is provided by the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the Cooperative Extension Service, and other appropriate agencies.

In exchange for entering land into the reserve, program participants receive annual rental payments in cash or commodities, based on their accepted bids per acre and the number of acres placed under 10-year contracts. For trees, program participants are offered the option of 15-year contracts. In addition, farmers receive one-time payments of 50 percent of the eligible costs of establishing vegetative cover on the reserve acreage.

To facilitate CRP program implementation, use of the funds, services, and facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] was authorized for fiscal years 1986–87. In subsequent years, CCC funds could not be used for this purpose unless CCC had received, in advance, funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out the program. Beginning in fiscal year 1988, funds for this program were requested to be appropriated in advance to CCC for rental, cost-sharing, and technical assistance payments. The Food Security Act of 1985, as amended by the 1990 FACT Act, provided authority to enter into CRP contracts through crop year 1995. Appropriations will be requested annually to make rental payments through fiscal year 2111.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Conservation Reserve Program [CRP], the Committee recommends $1,611,277,000, $31,483,000 less than the budget request and the House level, and $296,351,000 more than the 1991 level. In its budget request, the administration estimated the carryover of $147,824,000 that could be used in 1992. However, the current estimate of carryover funds is estimated to be $179,307,000. Therefore, the budget request level for 1992 has been reduced accordingly to reflect more current and realistic assumptions. The Committee continues to support the CRP and urges the Department to encourage further enrollment in the program.

The Committee urges the Secretary to allow the inclusion of marginal pasture lands in CRP acreage as authorized by section 1231(b)(2) and (3) of the Food Security Act of 1985. Such an allowance would be beneficial in areas of the country that have been damaged by floods, would improve water quality and wildlife habitat, and would help achieve the acreage goal set for the conservation reserve.

WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	.....
Budget estimate, 1992	$124,350,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	91,000,000

The Wetlands Reserve Program is authorized by title XIV, section 1438 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (FACT Act). It is one component of the larger Environmental Conservation Acreage Reserve Program [ECARP], which also includes the existing Conservation Reserve Program [CRP]. The 1990 FACT Act requires that at least 40 million acres be enrolled in ECARP by the end of 1995, including acreage already in the CRP. The primary objectives of the Wetlands Reserve Program are to preserve and restore wetlands, improve wildlife habitat, and protect migratory waterfowl. The Secretary of Agriculture, through designated ASCS county offices, uses program funds to enter into agreements with landowners that operate farmed or converted wetlands, farmed wetlands, or prior converted and adjoining land in CRP or riparian corridors. Agreements authorized under the program are perpetual easements with annual and lump-sum payments to landowners to preserve such lands. Technical assistance is provided by the Soil Conservation Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Committee recommends $91,000,000. This amount is $33,350,000 less than the budget request. There was no appropriation in 1991, and the House provided no funds. The Committee recommends bill language limiting enrollment in 1992 to 100,000 acres and providing 15-year, 30-year, or permanent easements. The budget request proposed to enter 150,000 acres in 1992 allowing permanent easements only. As discussed under ASCS salaries and expenses, the Committee will expect a report on the Wetlands Reserve Program.

TITLE III—FARMERS HOME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SMALL COMMUNITY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $530,000
Budget estimate, 1992	721,000
House allowance	572,000
Committee recommendation	552,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $7 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's small community and rural development activities and crop insurance programs. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development, the Committee recommends $552,000. This amount is $22,000 more than the 1991 level, $169,000 less than the budget request, and $20,000 less than the House level.

The Committee is aware that the Army Corps of Engineers is preparing to lower the Federal reservoirs on the Columbia and Snake Rivers during the spring of 1992 in order to assist in efforts to rebuild anadromous fish stocks. The lowering of the reservoirs will adversely impact family farms in Oregon and Washington which pump irrigation water directly from the Columbia and Snake Rivers. The Committee urges the Department to work with these family farms in identifying and utilizing existing Federal programs to assist in extending irrigation intakes and relocating pumping facilities.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Farmers Home Administration provides credit for those in rural America who are unable to get credit from other sources at reasonable rates and terms. Loan programs are administered through the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, the Rural Development Insurance Fund, and the Rural Development Loan Fund. The agency also administers several grant programs.

The agency was established by the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 and operates principally under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1921 et

seq.) and title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.).

The Farmers Home Administration makes loans from funds borrowed from the U.S. Treasury.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table reflects the loan and grant program levels of programs administered by the agency in 1990, proposed in the budget for 1991, and recommended by the Committee:

LOAN AND GRANT LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1991 level	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Rural housing insurance fund:				
Low-income housing loans (sec. 502):				
Subsidized direct loans	1,226,451	559,000	1,226,451	1,256,451
Unsubsidized direct loans	50,000	.....	50,000	50,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans	70,000	347,000	350,000	100,000
Subsidized guaranteed loans	30,000	347,000	.....	.....
Rural housing site loans (sec. 524)	600	.....	600	600
Rural rental housing loans (sec. 515)	573,900	341,000	573,900	573,900
Very low income repair loans (sec. 504)	11,330	11,100	11,330	11,330
Domestic farm labor loans	16,300	16,250	16,300	16,300
Credit sales of acquired property	288,000	284,000	284,000	.....
Subtotal, Rural housing insurance fund	2,266,581	1,905,350	2,512,581	2,008,581
Self-help housing land development fund	500	.....	500	500
Agricultural credit insurance fund:				
Farm ownership loans: [1]				
Direct	33,000	37,000	46,500	87,000
Fiscal year 1990 act	13,500	.....	.....	.....
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans	509,000	150,000	509,000	774,000
Subsidized guaranteed loans	.....	50,000	.....	.....
Farm operating loans: [1]				
Direct	900,000	410,000	900,000	840,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans	2,600,000	2,000,000	2,600,000	1,000,000
Subsidized guaranteed loans	.....	564,000	.....	.....
Soil and water loans:				
Direct	5,500	.....	5,500	5,500
Guaranteed	1,500	.....	1,500	1,500
Indian land acquisition	1,000	2,000	1,000	1,000
Emergency loans	600,000	25,000	600,000	600,000
Watershed and flood prevention loans	4,000	.....	4,000	4,000
Resource conservation and development loans	600	.....	600	600
Credit sales of acquired property	200,000	250,000	250,000	.....
Subtotal, agricultural credit insurance fund	4,868,100	3,488,000	4,918,100	3,313,600
Rural development insurance fund:				
Water and waste disposal loans	500,000	425,000	600,000	500,000
Guaranteed	35,000	.....	35,000	35,000
Community facility loans	100,000	45,700	100,000	100,000
Guaranteed	25,000	50,000	25,000	25,000
Industrial development loans (guaranteed)	100,000	95,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, rural development insurance fund	760,000	615,700	860,000	760,000
Rural development loan fund	32,500	35,000	32,500	32,500
Rural rental assistance payments	319,900	269,800	308,100	319,900

LOAN AND GRANT LEVELS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1991 level	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Home repair grants	12,500	5,000	12,500	12,500
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	11,000	5,000	11,000	11,000
Mutual and self-help housing grants	8,750	.....	8,750	8,750
Supervisory and technical assistance grants	.....	.....	2,500	.....
Compensation for construction defects	500	.....	500	500
Rural housing preservation grants	23,000	10,000	23,000	23,000
Rural rental assistance (voucher program)	.....	189,928	.....	.....
State medication grants	3,750	2,000	3,750	3,750
Water and waste disposal grants	300,000	225,000	350,000	350,000
Rural community fire protection grants	3,500	.....	3,500	3,500
Rural development grants	20,750	20,000	20,750	20,750
Solid waste management grants	1,500	.....	1,500	3,000
Emergency community water assistance grants	10,000	.....	.....	10,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	715,150	726,728	745,850	766,650
Total, loans, grants, and payments	8,642,831	6,770,778	9,069,531	6,881,831

[1] Does not reflect Public Law 101-508, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, levels.

Rural Housing Insurance Fund

The Rural Housing Insurance Fund was established under the authority contained in section 1003(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–117), approved August 10, 1965. Public Law 89–117 authorized an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of the fund.

This fund may be used to insure or guarantee rural housing loans; loans for purchasing new or existing rural homes, loans for modernizing or improving rural dwellings, especially in order to make them safer or more sanitary; loans for rural rental and cooperative housing; farm labor housing loans; rural housing site loans; and mobile home park loans. Beginning in fiscal year 1978, rental assistance payments were made from the fund. Loan programs are limited to rural areas which include towns, villages and other places of not more than 10,000 population, which are not part of an urban area, and areas with a population in excess of 10,000 but less than 20,000 if such area is not included in a standard metropolitan statistical area [SMSA] and has a serious lack of mortgage credit for low- and moderate-income borrowers.

This fund provides a variety of loans, within the income categories mentioned, including the following low-income housing assistance: subsidized loans for repairs, general purpose loans, domestic farm labor loans, and rental or cooperative loans. Unsubsidized loans for low-income persons include general purpose loans, site loans, and certain repair loans.

HOUSING LOANS

	Insured	Guaranteed	Total
Loan levels, 1991	$2,166,581,000	$100,000,000	[1] $2,266,581,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,211,350,000	694,000,000	1,905,350,000
House allowance	2,162,581,000	350,000,000	2,512,581,000
Committee recommendation	1,908,581,000	100,000,000	2,008,581,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $25,722 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

Very low-income housing repair loans (section 504).—Loans are made to eligible very low-income applicants who are owners of farms or nonfarm rural property, for the purpose of improving or modernizing a rural dwelling, making the dwellings safer or more sanitary, or removing hazards. The Secretary determines the maximum amount of the loan. These secured loans are made at 1 percent interest and are repayable within 20 years, except that a loan for less than $2,500 need only be secured by a promissory note.

Rural housing building and repair loans (section 502).—Loans are made to enable eligible low-income applicants to purchase, construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings in rural areas, if their need for necessary housing cannot be met with financial assistance from other sources. Not less than 40 percent of the funding authorized nationally shall be set aside and 30 percent in each State will be available for very low-income families. These loans bear a note rate based on the cost of money to the Treasury with provisions for interest credit which may reduce the interest rate to as low as 1 percent under certain circumstances. Such loans may not exceed amounts necessary to provide adequate housing, modest in size, design, and cost.

Rural rental and cooperative building loans (section 515).—Loans are authorized to be made to individuals, corporations, Indian tribes, associations, public bodies, trusts, or partnerships to provide moderate cost rental or cooperative housing and related facilities for elderly or handicapped persons or families and other persons of low and moderate income in rural areas. Repaired or rehabilitated rental projects are encouraged in order to provide affordable housing. These loans are repayable in not more than 50 years and currently bear a note rate based on the cost of money to the Treasury with provision for interest credit to tenants which may reduce the interest rate to as low as 1 percent under certain circumstances. These loans are made only if the need for necessary housing cannot be met with financial assistance from other sources except in the case of public bodies.

The Farmers Home Administration has in the past made its rural rental housing loans in conjunction with the Department of Housing and Urban Development's section 8 Rent Subsidy Program. Loans made for units that will receive section 8 assistance bear an interest rate that is reduced either 1 or 2 percent below the unsubsidized rate, depending upon the circumstances of the individual project.

Farm labor housing loans (section 514).—Loans are authorized to be made to a farm owner, to certain public or broad-based private nonprofit organizations, public bodies, or to a nonprofit organiza-

tion of farm workers to provide modest living quarters, basic household furnishing, and related facilities, including land necessary for an adequate site, for domestic farm labor. Loans will be made based on a determination of need considering housing needs of domestic farm labor, including migrant farm workers in the area, without regard to other housing needs in the area. These loans are repayable in not more than 33 years and bear interest not in excess of 1 percent, except under certain circumstances. Loans to organizations may be made simultaneously with farm labor housing grants which are discussed elsewhere in this report.

Rural housing site loans (section 524) (unsubsidized).—Loans are made for purchase and development of land to be subdivided into building sites for low to moderate income housing borrowers and rural rental and cooperative housing borrowers. Insured loans are made at a note rate based on the cost of money to the Treasury, and are repayable in 2 years.

Credit sales of acquired property.—Property is sold out of inventory and is made to an eligible buyer by providing him with a Farmers Home Administration loan.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For housing loans, the Committee recommends a level of $2,008,581,000. This amount is $258,000,000 less than the 1991 level, $504,000,000 less than the House allowance, and $103,231,000 more than the budget request.

The table at the beginning of the Farmers Home Administration section of this report illustrates the distribution of these funds among the various housing programs. Noting that the cost of subsidized guarantees exceeds the cost of direct loans in the section 502 program, the Committee recommends deleting the $30,000,000 in subsidized guaranteed loans that was provided in 1991 and increasing the direct loans by a like amount. The Committee does not recommend separate authority for credit sales of acquired property, noting that the direct and guaranteed loan programs can be used for that purpose.

The Committee has included bill language similar to that provided in Public Law 102–27 requiring that up to $35,000,000 of section 502 loans be made available for the Deferred Mortgage Demonstration Program authorized in the National Affordable Housing Act. This demonstration authorizes FmHA to defer up to 25 percent of a household's payment to determine eligibility for section 502 loans. The law authorizes up to 10 percent of section 502 funds may be used for the demonstration. The Committee will expect a report on the operation of this demonstration program by March 30, 1992.

The President's budget proposed a housing voucher program funded at $189,928,000. The Committee rejects this proposal.

RHIF PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Direct loan subsidy	Guaranteed loan subsidy	Total subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 1991				
Budget estimate, 1992	$329,000,000	$96,680,000	$426,511,000	$425,173,000
House allowance	636,549,000	12,360,000	648,909,000	425,173,000
Committee recommendation	548,970,000	1,130,000	550,100,000	428,746,000

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, establishes the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table reflects the cost of the loan programs under credit reform.

	1991 enacted	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Loan subsidies:				
Single family (sec. 502):				
Direct		$126,578,000	$312,536,000	$286,461,000
Guaranteed		96,680,000	12,360,000	1,130,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)		4,897,000	5,280,000	4,999,000
Farm labor (sec. 514)		8,975,000	9,536,000	9,002,000
Rental housing (sec. 515)		147,657,000	268,585,000	248,499,000
Site loans				9,000
Credit sales of acquired property		41,724,000	40,612,000	
Total, loan subsidies		426,511,000	648,909,000	550,100,000
RHIF salaries and expenses		425,173,000	425,173,000	428,746,000

RURAL RENTAL ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

Limitation, 1991	[1] $319,900,000
Budget estimate, 1992	269,800,000
House allowance	308,100,000
Committee recommendation	319,900,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $4,005 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 established a Rural Rental Assistance Program to be administered by Farmers Home Administration through the Rural Housing Insurance Fund.

The objective of the program is to reduce rents paid by low-income families living in FmHA-financed rental projects and farm labor housing facilities. Under this program, low-income tenants will contribute the higher of (1) 30 percent of monthly adjusted income, (2) 10 percent of monthly income, or (3) designated housing payments from a welfare agency.

Payments from the fund are made to the project owner for the difference between the tenant's payment and the approved rental rate established for the unit.

The program is administered in tandem with FmHA section 515 rural rental and cooperative housing programs, and the farm labor loan and grant programs. Priority will be given to existing projects for units occupied by low-income families to extend expiring contracts or provide full amounts authorized to existing contracts; any remaining authority will be used for projects receiving new construction commitments under sections 514, 515, or 516 for very low-income families with certain limitations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For rural rental assistance payments, the Committee recommends an authorization of $319,900,000 which is the same as the amount available in fiscal year 1991, $50,100,000 above the budget request, and $11,800,000 more than the House level.

The 1991 appropriation for rental assistance payments was $308,100,000. However, in 1991, $11,800,000 for debt forgiveness or payments to households under section 502(c)(5)(D) of the housing act was provided through the rural housing insurance fund. Due to credit reform legislation, an appropriation is required. The Committee has included the 1991 level of $11,800,000 for this program in this account. The House provided the same amount; however, it did not increase the 1991 appropriation for rental assistance payments accordingly.

SELF-HELP HOUSING LAND DEVELOPMENT FUND

Loan level, 1991	[1] $500,000
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	500,000
Committee recommendation	500,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $6 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

This fund is authorized by section 523(b)(1)(B) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. It is used as a revolving fund for making loans to public or private nonprofit organizations for the acquisition and development of land as building sites to be subdivided and sold to eligible families, nonprofit organizations, and cooperatives.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $500,000 for self-help housing land development loans. There was no budget request. This level is the same as the 1991 amount and the House recommendation.

SELF-HELP HOUSING LAND DEVELOPMENT FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 1991		
Budget estimate, 1992		
House allowance		
Committee recommendation	$43,000	$21,000

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, establishes the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the

lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the self-help housing land development fund program account, the Committee recommends $43,000 for the subsidy cost of the loan program under credit reform, and $21,000 for administrative expenses. The House provided no funds and there was no budget request.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND

The Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund is used to insure or guarantee farm ownership, soil and water, farm operating, and emergency loans to individuals, as well as the following types of loans to associations: irrigation and drainage, grazing, Indian tribe land acquisition, watershed protection, flood prevention, and resource conservation and development. The insurance endorsement on each insured loan may include an agreement by the Government to purchase the loan after a specified initial period.

FmHA is also authorized to provide financial assistance to borrowers by guaranteeing loans made by private lenders having a contract of guarantee from FmHA as approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Wing programs are financed through this fund:

Farm ownership loans.—Made to borrowers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere to restructure their debts, improve or purchase farms, refinance nonfarm enterprises which supplement but do not supplant farm income, or make additions to farms. An insured loan may not exceed $200,000 and a guaranteed loan may not exceed $300,000. Loans are made for 40 years or less.

Farm operating loans.—Provide short-to-intermediate term production or chattel credit to farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere, to improve their farm and home operations, and to develop or maintain a reasonable standard of living. An insured loan may not exceed $200,000 and a guaranteed loan is limited to $400,000. The term of the loan varies from 1 to 7 years.

Emergency disaster loans.—Made available in designated areas (counties) and in contiguous counties where property damage and/or severe production losses have occurred as a direct result of a natural disaster. Areas may be declared by the President or designated for emergency loan assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture. The loan may be up to $500,000.

Soil and water conservation loans.—Made to individuals, cooperatives, corporations, or partnerships who own and/or operate a farm, for land and water development, use and conservation. The loan limit is $200,000 for an insured loan and $300,000 for a guaranteed loan. The repayment period may be up to 40 years.

Indian tribe land acquisition loans.—Made to qualified Indian tribes or tribal corporations to acquire land or interests in land within the tribes' reservations or Alaskan Indian community, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, for use of the tribe or

the corporation or the members thereof. Loans are made for 40 years or less.

Watershed protection and flood prevention loans.—Made to sponsors of projects approved for operation by the Soil Conservation Service. Loans are made to local organizations for financing the local share of the cost of installing or repairing works of improvement and water storage facilities, purchasing sites or rights-of-way, and covering related costs. Loans are for not more than 50 years and not more than $10,000,000 for any single plan.

Resource conservation and development loans.—Made to local sponsoring organizations when needed for financing the local share of the cost of installing, repairing, or improving works of improvement and water storage facilities, purchasing sites or rights-of-way and for related costs in approved resource conservation and development projects. No loan may be made until the Soil Conservation Service and the local organization have agreed on a plan for development work. These loans are repayable in not more than 30 years.

Credit sales of acquired property.—Property is sold out of inventory and is made to an eligible buyer by providing him with a Farmers Home Administration loan.

FARM OWNERSHIP LOANS

	Insured	Guaranteed	Total
Loan level, 1991	[1] $46,500,000	$509,000,000	[2] [3] $555,500,000
Budget estimate, 1992	37,000,000	200,000,000	237,000,000
House allowance	46,500,000	509,000,000	555,500,000
Committee recommendation	87,000,000	774,000,000	861,000,000

[1] $13,500,000 was made available by Public Law 100-161.
[2] Does not reflect Public Law 101-508, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, levels of:

Farm ownership:	
Direct	$43,700,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	744,000,000
Subsidized guaranteed	39,300,000

[3] Does not reflect levels made available by USDA of:

Farm ownership:	
Direct	$57,200,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	994,000,000
Subsidized guaranteed	39,300,000

Subtitle A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act contains authorizations for farm ownership loans. Farm ownership loans are used for maintaining the family farm by helping owner-operators to restructure their debts or make adjustments in their operations to comply with local sanitation or other requirements, to keep up with advances in agricultural technology, or to better use their land and labor resources to meet changing market requirements. Ownership loans are also used to purchase and develop farms, especially for beginning farmers.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is recommending a total program level of $861,000,000 for farm ownership loans. This amount is $305,500,000 more than the amount available in fiscal year 1991, $624,000,000 more than the budget request, and $305,500,000 more than the House level.

OPERATING LOANS

	Insured	Guaranteed	Total
Loan level, 1991	$900,000,000	$2,600,000,000 [1] [2]	$3,500,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	410,000,000	2,564,000,000	2,974,000,000
House allowance	900,000,000	2,600,000,000	3,500,000,000
Committee recommendation	840,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,840,000,000

[1] Does not reflect Public Law 101–508, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, levels of:

Farm ownership:	
Direct	$493,300,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	2,412,000,000
Subsidized guaranteed	442,700,000

[2] Does not reflect levels made available by USDA of:

Farm ownership:	
Direct	$493,300,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	2,162,000,000
Subsidized guaranteed	442,700,000

Subtitle B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act contains the authorization for insured and guaranteed operating loans. These loans are accompanied by supervisory assistance in farm and financial management. Operating credit is needed by family farmers throughout the United States who are unable to obtain credit from private and cooperative sources. This helps to provide opportunity for farm operators and encourage farm families to remain in rural areas.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is recommending a total program level of $1,840,000,000 for operating loans. This amount is $1,134,000,000 less than the budget request, $1,660,000,000 less than the amount available in 1991, and $1,660,000,000 less than the House level. Within the total program level, $840,000,000 is recommended for insured operating loans, and $1,000,000,000 is recommended for guaranteed operating loans.

REAL ESTATE LOANS (OTHER THAN FARM OWNERSHIP)

	Insured	Guaranteed	Total
Loan level, 1991	$6,500,000	$1,500,000	[1] $8,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,000,000		
House allowance	6,500,000	1,500,000	8,000,000
Committee recommendation	6,500,000	1,500,000	8,000,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $92 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

These loans include Indian land acquisition loans, and soil and water loans. Indian land acquisition loans are made to Indian tribes or tribal corporations to acquire lands or an interest in lands within the tribe's reservation or Alaskan Indian community. Soil and water loans are made to owners and/or operators of farms to fund soil conservation and development, forestation, drainage of farm land, establishment of a permanent pasture, pollution control or energy-saving measures.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For real estate loans, other than farm ownership loans, the Committee recommends $8,000,000. Included in this program level is $5,500,000 for insured soil and water loans, $1,500,000 for guaranteed soil and water loans, and $1,000,000 for insured Indian land acquisition loans. These levels are the same as the House levels. They are also the same levels as provided in 1991. The budget proposed $2,000,000 for insured Indian land acquisition loans.

EMERGENCY DISASTER LOANS

Loan level, 1991	[1] $600,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	25,000,000
House allowance	600,000,000
Committee recommendation	600,000,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $7,800 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

Emergency loans are made available in designated areas and in contiguous counties where property damage and/or severe production losses have occurred as a direct result of a natural disaster. Areas may be declared or designated for emergency loan assistance by the President, Secretary of Agriculture, or the Administrator of FmHA.

Emergency loans are made to established eligible farmers, ranchers, and aquaculture operators. Partnerships and private domestic corporations and cooperatives may also qualify, providing they are primarily engaged in agricultural or aquacultural production. Loans may be made for actual losses arising from natural disasters.

Actual loss loans may be made for physical losses to repair, restore, or replace damaged or destroyed farm property, livestock, and livestock products, and supplies, and for production losses to compensate for loss of income based on reduced production of crops and/or livestock products resulting from the disaster. Eligible farmers may use actual loss loan funds to purchase livestock, poultry, or other animals and pay costs incident to reorganizing a farming system to make it a sound operation. The reorganized farming operation, however, must be approximately equivalent in earning capacity to the operation conducted prior to the disaster. Under certain conditions, loan funds may be used to buy essential home equipment and furnishings and for limited refinancing of debts.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For emergency disaster loans, the Committee recommends $600,000,000 which is $575,000,000 more than the budget request and the same as the House and 1991 levels.

SOIL CONSERVATION LOANS

Loan level, 1991	[1] $4,600,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	4,600,000
Committee recommendation	4,600,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $59 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

Public Law 92-419, approved August 30, 1972, provided for making insured loans for watershed works of improvement, flood prevention, and resource conservation and development.

Watershed and flood prevention loans are made to local organizations for financing the local share of the cost of installing or repairing works of improvement and water storage facilities, purchasing sites or rights-of-way and covering related costs. Loans are repayable in not more than 50 years at an interest rate based on the average rate paid by the U.S. Treasury on obligations of similar maturity.

Resource conservation and development loans are made to sponsors of projects approved for operation by the Soil Conservation Service. Such loans are repayable in not more than 30 years, and bear interest at a rate based on the average rate paid by the Treasury on issues of similar maturity.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For soil conservation loans, the Committee recommends $4,600,000 including $4,000,000 for watershed and flood prevention loans and $600,000 for resource conservation and development loans. These levels are the same as the 1991 and House amounts. No funding was requested in the budget.

CREDIT SALES OF ACQUIRED PROPERTY

Appropriations, 1991	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	250,000,000
House allowance	250,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

ACIF PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Direct loan subsidy	Guaranteed subsidy	Total subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 1991				
Budget estimate, 1992	$156,517,000	$98,343,000	$254,860,000	$230,179,000
House allowance	362,436,000	46,500,000	408,936,000	230,179,000
Committee recommendation	271,073,000	51,388,000	322,461,000	229,557,000

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, establishes the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table reflects the cost of the loan programs under credit reform.

	1991 enacted	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Loan subsidies:				
Farm ownership:				
Direct		$9,144,000	$18,089,000	$19,865,000

	1991 enacted	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Guaranteed unsubsidized		7,526,000	15,270,000	38,870,000
Guaranteed subsidized		18,308,000		
Farm operating:				
Direct		66,952,000	189,000,000	128,937,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized		24,981,000	31,200,000	12,475,000
Guaranteed subsidized		47,528,000		
Soil and water:				
Direct			2,585,000	456,000
Guaranteed			30,000	43,000
Indian tribe land acquisition		505,000	1,000,000	253,000
Emergency disaster		5,065,000	32,100,000	121,560,000
Watershed and flood prevention			1,880,000	1,000
Resource conservation			282,000	1,000
Credit sales of acquired property		74,851,000	117,500,000	
Total, loan subsidies		254,860,000	408,936,000	322,461,000
ACIF salaries and expenses		230,179,000	230,179,000	229,557,000

The Committee has changed House bill language to prohibit the making of loans except to the extent provided in advance in appropriations acts.

STATE MEDIATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $3,750,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,000,000
House allowance	3,750,000
Committee recommendation	3,750,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $49 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The State Mediation Program is authorized by section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 to provide matching grants to eligible States which have existing State mediation programs for agricultural borrowers.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the State Mediation Program, the Committee recommends $3,750,000. This amount is the same as both the 1991 level and the House level, and $1,750,000 more than the budget request.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND

The Rural Development Act of 1972 authorized the establishment of the Rural Development Insurance Fund under section 309A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. This act provided for transfer to the Rural Development Insurance Fund the assets and liabilities of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund applicable to loans for water systems and waste disposal facilities. This fund is used to insure or guarantee loans for water systems and waste disposal facilities, community facilities, and industrial development in rural areas.

WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL LOANS

	Insured	Guaranteed	Total
Loan level, 1991	$500,000,000	$35,000,000	$535,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	425,000,000		425,000,000
House allowance	600,000,000	35,000,000	635,000,000
Committee recommendation	500,000,000	35,000,000	535,000,000

Loans are made to public bodies, organizations operated on a not-for-profit basis, and Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations and other federally recognized Indian tribes, for the development of storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water or the collection, treatment, or disposal of waste in rural areas. A rural area includes any area in any city or town which has a population of not more than 10,000 inhabitants.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For insured water and waste disposal loans, the Committee recommends a level of $500,000,000. This amount is $75,000,000 more than the budget estimate, the same as the 1991 amount, and $100,000,000 less than the House level.

For guaranteed water and waste disposal loans, the Committee recommends a level of $35,000,000, the same as the House and 1991 levels. There was no budget request.

COMMUNITY FACILITY LOANS

	Insured	Guaranteed	Total
Loan level, 1991	$100,000,000	$25,000,000	$125,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	45,700,000	50,000,000	95,700,000
House allowance	100,000,000	25,000,000	125,000,000
Committee recommendation	100,000,000	25,000,000	125,000,000

Loans are made to public bodies, organizations operated on a not-for-profit basis, and Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations and other federally recognized Indian tribes, to construct, enlarge, extend, or otherwise improve community facilities providing essential services to rural residents. Such facilities include those providing or supporting overall community development such as fire and rescue services, health care, hydroelectric generation, and community, social, and cultural benefits. Loans are made for facilities which primarily serve rural residents of open country and rural towns and villages of not more than 20,000 population.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For insured community facility loans, the Committee recommends a level of $100,000,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 level, $54,300,000 more than the budget request, and the same as the House allowance.

For guaranteed community facility loans, the Committee recommends a level of $25,000,000, the same as the House level and the 1991 amount and $25,000,000 less than the budget request.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT LOANS

Loan level, 1991	$100,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	95,000,000
House allowance	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

These guaranteed loans are made to public, private, or cooperative organizations organized for profit or nonprofit, to certain Indian tribes, or to individuals for the purpose of improving the economic and environmental climate in rural areas.

Such purposes include financing business and industrial acquisition, construction, conversion, enlargement, repair or modernization; financing the purchase and development of land, easements, rights-of-way, buildings, equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies and materials; and paying start-up costs and supplying working capital. Industrial development loans may be made in any area that is not within the outer boundary of any city having a population of 50,000 or more and its immediately adjacent urbanized and urbanizing areas with a population density of more than 100 persons per square mile.

Special consideration for such loans is given to rural areas and cities having a population of 25,000 or less. Loans may be guaranteed by FmHA not to exceed 90 percent of the loss. Loans are repayable in not more than 30 years, depending on the loan purpose, and bear interest at a rate agreed upon by the lender and borrower.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For guaranteed industrial development loans for fiscal year 1991, the Committee recommends a level of $100,000,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 level, $5,000,000 more than the budget request, and the same as the House level.

The Committee urges the Farmers Home Administration to consider the loan application for a $1,300,000 rural industrial development guaranteed loan by the city of Spokane for the Spokane marketplace.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Direct loan subsidy	Guaranteed loan subsidy	Total subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriation, 1991				
Budget estimate, 1992	$69,168,000	$6,589,000	$75,757,000	$54,906,000
House allowance	110,000,000	9,085,000	119,085,000	54,906,000
Committee recommendation	86,911,000	7,008,000	93,919,000	52,286,000

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, establishes the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table reflects the cost of the loan programs under credit reform.

	1991 enacted	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Loan subsidies:				
Water and sewer:				
Direct		$63,678,000	$96,000,000	$74,900,000
Guaranteed			840,000	630,000
Community facility:				
Direct		5,490,000	14,000,000	12,011,000
Guaranteed		1,016,000	325,000	508,000
Industrial development		5,573,000	7,920,000	5,870,000
Total, loan subsidies		75,757,000	119,085,000	93,919,000
RDIF salaries and expenses		54,906,000	54,906,000	52,286,000

The Committee recommends bill language prohibiting the transfer of loan funds in the rural development insurance fund from one type of loan to another.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

	Appropriation	Loan level
Appropriations, 1991	$30,5000,000	[1] $32,500,000
Budget estimate, 1992		35,000,000
House allowance		32,500,000
Committee recommendation		32,500,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $422 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Rural Development Loan Fund [RDLF] was originally authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452) with FmHA making and administering the loans for the Office of Economic Opportunity. The program was transferred to the Community Services Administration [CSA]; however, no new loans were made by the CSA. When the CSA was abolished, this program was transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS]. New loans were made and administered by HHS until its transfer to the Department of Agriculture. At the time of transfer, FmHA acquired a portfolio of 29 direct loans for approximately $38,000,000.

The making of rural development loans by the Department of Agriculture was reauthorized by Public Law 99-425, the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986. Funding for such loans is to be derived from repayments to the fund (principal and interest) from prior loans made from the fund, as well as any additional moneys that might be made available.

Section 1323(b)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985, Public Law 99-198, authorized the use of these funds pursuant to the first, second, and last sentences of section 623(a) of the Community Economic Development Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)).

Loans will be made to intermediary borrowers (that is, small investment groups) who in turn will relend the funds to rural busi-

nesses, community development corporations, private nonprofit organizations, public agencies, et cetera, for the purpose of improving business, industry, community facilities, and employment opportunities and diversification of the economy in rural areas.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Rural Development Loan Fund, the Committee provides a loan level of $32,500,000. This amount is the same as both the 1991 level and the House amount and $2,500,000 less than the budget request.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Direct loan subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriation, 1991		
Budget estimate, 1992	$17,510,000	$689,000
House allowance	22,050,000	689,000
Committee recommendation	16,260,000	656,000

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, establishes the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $16,260,000 for the subsidy cost of rural development loans. This amount is $5,790,000 less than the House level and $1,250,000 more than the budget request. For administrative expenses, $656,000 is recommended, $33,000 less than both the House and budget request levels.

RURAL GRANT PROGRAMS

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $300,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	225,000,000
House allowance	350,000,000
Committee recommendation	350,000,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $3,900 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

This grant program is authorized by section 306 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended. Grants are authorized to be made to associations, including nonprofit corporations, public and quasi-public agencies, and certain Indian tribes, to finance specific projects for the development, storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water or the collection, treatment, or disposal of waste in rural areas. Grants are used for water and waste disposal projects serving the most financially needy communities to reduce user costs to a reasonable level, to alleviate health hazards, and to meet national safe drinking water and clean water standards in rural areas without the financial capability to do so on their own.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $350,000,000 for rural water and waste disposal grants, $50,000,000 more than the level available in fiscal year 1991, $125,000,000 more than the budget estimate, and the same as the House level.

The Committee has been made aware of the dire threat to health posed by inadequate water in Washington and Benton Counties, AR. The Committee will expect the Department to review the Two-Ton Water Loop project designed to correct this crisis and report to the Committee.

The Committee requests a report, on a State-by-State basis, of the amount of water and waste disposal funds going to waste disposal projects, the number of projects receiving financing, in addition to FmHA funds, from State revolving funds [SRF], and the amount of SRF funds received. FmHA should ensure that it records for each waste disposal facilities project that it finances the amount of financing provided, and the amount, if any, from the relevant SRF.

VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $12,500,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,000,000
House allowance	12,500,000
Committee recommendation	12,500,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $162 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

This grant program is authorized under section 504 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949. The Rural Housing Repair Grant Program is carried out by making grants for very low-income elderly owner-occupants to make necessary repairs to their homes in order to make such dwellings safe and sanitary, and remove hazards to the health of the occupants, their families, or the community.

Such grants may be made to cover the cost of improvements or additions, such as repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, providing a convenient and sanitary water supply, installing screens, repairing or providing structural supports, or making similar repairs, additions, or improvements including all preliminary and installation costs in obtaining central water and sewer service. A grant can be made in combination with a section 504 very low-income housing repair loan.

The Secretary determines the maximum amount of grant or combination of loan and grant.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For very low-income housing repair grants the Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,500,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 appropriation, $7,500,000 more than the budget estimate, and the same as the House level.

GRANTS FOR RURAL HOUSING FOR DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $11,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	5,000,000
House allowance	11,000,000
Committee recommendation	11,000,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $143 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

Under section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, FmHA is authorized to share with States or other political subdivisions, public or private nonprofit organizations, or nonprofit organizations of farmworkers, the cost of providing low-rent housing, basic household furnishings, and related facilities to be used by domestic farm laborers.

Such housing may be for year-round or seasonal occupancy and consist of family units, apartments, or dormitory-type units, constructed in an economical manner, and not of elaborate or extravagant design or materials. Grant assistance may not exceed 90 percent of the total development cost. Applicants furnish as much of the development cost as they can afford by using their own resources, by borrowing either directly from private sources, or by obtaining an insured loan under section 514 of the Housing Act.

The applicant must agree to charge rentals which do not exceed amounts approved by the Secretary, maintain the housing at all times in a safe and sanitary condition, and give occupancy preference to domestic farm laborers.

The obligations incurred by the applicant as a condition of the grant continue for 50 years from the date of the grant unless terminated sooner by the Farmers Home Administration. To the extent practicable, grant obligations are secured by a mortgage on the housing or other security. In the event of default, the Farmers Home Administration has the option to require repayment of the grant.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For grants for rural housing for domestic farm labor, the Committee recommends $11,000,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 appropriation, $6,000,000 more than the budget request, and the same as the House level. Consistent with past years, the Committee recommends making this appropriation available until expended.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $8,750,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	8,750,000
Committee recommendation	8,750,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $114 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

This grant program is authorized under section 523 of the Housing Act of 1949. Grants are made to local organizations to promote the development of mutual or self-help housing programs under which groups of usually 6 to 10 families build their own homes by mutually exchanging labor. Funds may be used to pay the cost of construction supervisors who will work with families to guide them

in the construction of their homes and for administrative expenses of the organizations providing the self-help assistance. This program also provides contract funds for training to be provided to members and staff of self-help technical assistance grant recipient organizations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For mutual and self-help housing grants, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,750,000. This amount is the same as both the level provided in 1991 and the House level. No appropriation was requested by the administration.

The Committee directs FmHA to continue the self-help housing regional technical assistance program. In order to ensure that more families have the opportunity for home ownership, the Committee directs that the technical assistance program focus attention on developing more local self-help housing programs, as well as assisting in the management of programs currently operating.

SUPERVISORY AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	.....
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	$2,500,000
Committee recommendation	.....

This program is authorized under section 509(f)(6) of the National Afforadable Housing Act and section 525 of the Housing Act of 1949. The program allows grants to be made to nonprofit organizations to assist with rural housing preparation, development and management in underserved and poor counties.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For supervisory and technical assistance grants, the Committee recommends no funding. The House provided $2,500,000, and there was no budget request.

RURAL COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $3,500,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	3,500,000
Committee recommendation	3,500,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $46 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

This assistance was authorized by section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978. Grants are made to public bodies to organize, train, and equip local firefighting forces, including those of Indian tribes or other native groups, to prevent, control, and suppress fires threatening human lives, crops, livestock, farmsteads or other improvements, pastures, orchards, wildlife, rangeland, woodland, and other resources in rural areas.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For rural community fire protection grants, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,500,000. This amount is the same

as both the 1991 level and the House level. No appropriation was requested by the administration.

COMPENSATION FOR CONSTRUCTION DEFECTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $500,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	500,000
Committee recommendation	500,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $6 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

Under section 509(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay the cost of correcting structural defects and claims arising from defects on newly constructed dwellings purchased with FmHA financial assistance. Claims will not be paid until provisions under the builder's warranty have been fully pursued. Requests for compensation for construction defects must be made within 18 months of loan closing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $500,000 for compensation for construction defects. This amount is $500,000 more than the budget request and the same as the level provided in fiscal year 1991 and by the House.

RURAL HOUSING PRESERVATION GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $23,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	10,000,000
House allowance	23,000,000
Committee recommendation	23,000,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $299 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The Rural Housing Preservation Grants Program is authorized under the Farmers Home Administration by section 533 of the Housing Act of 1949 to make grants to State or local governments, Indian tribes, private nonprofit organizations, and a consortia of other eligible grantees to rehabilitate housing which is either owned or occupied by low or very-low income persons or families.

While the section 504 loan and grant programs are aimed at the same income levels as this program, they are restricted to the elderly. Also, the Farmers Home Administration staff limitations are such that an increase in funding or expansion of responsibility may not provide satisfactory results.

The Preservation Grants Program employs local housing expertise and improves the delivery of rehabilitation assistance. Farmers Home ranks and funds qualified applicants (for example, governments, or nonprofit organizations), but is not responsible for processing individual applications for assistance. The grantee operates the program on a day-to-day basis, and FmHA reviews and monitors the activities of the grantee.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $23,000,000 for rural housing preservation grants. This amount is the same as the 1991 level,

$13,000,000 more than the budget request, and the same as the House level.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $20,750,000
Budget estimate, 1992	20,000,000
House allowance	20,750,000
Committee recommendation	20,750,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $270 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

Rural development grants are authorized by section 310B(c) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to facilitate the development of business and industry in rural areas by financing improvements and enhancements to small industrial complexes. Grants are made for the development of industrial facilities including land, buildings, equipment, and supporting facilities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $20,750,000 for rural development grants. This amount is the same as both the 1991 level and the House level and $750,000 more than the budget request. The Committee has included bill language clarifying the authorization for this program.

The Committee concurs with House bill language providing at least $500,000 for technical assistance and training for rural communities needing improved transportation systems or facilities to promote economic development. This program includes the establishment of passenger, human services, and commercial transportation facilities and systems which enhance rural economic growth. These funds may be used to provide onsite technical assistance to rural local governments and transportation systems, to develop training materials, and to conduct necessary training sessions on transportation issues and resources for rural areas.

The Committee also recommends bill language providing $2,000,000 of this appropriation for rural technology grants for statewide private nonprofit public television systems whose coverage area is predominately rural. Funds may be used for capital equipment and program costs, and other costs necessary to the operation of such a demonstration; $2,000,000 was provided in 1991.

The Red River Trade Corridor is a regional cooperative development program comprised of Minnesota, North Dakota, and Manitoba. The three jurisdictions are working in a cooperative program to increase activity within the marketplace and to promote the regions central North America location and economic opportunities on an international scale. The Committee provides up to $400,000 for this project.

Also provided is up to $100,000 for the Economic Development Council of Northern Vermont, Inc. and New Hampshire's North Country Council to develop an aggressive marketing program for the region's forest products industry.

The city of Russell, KS, AGCO, Inc. and Farmland, Inc. have joined together to build a wheat protein and starch modification facility. The Committee provides up to $500,000 for the city of Russell to assist in financing this project.

The Committee provides $250,000 for a grant to continue to implement a strategy to encourage rural revitalization in Maui County, HI. This grant is to be administered by the Maui Economic Development Board, Inc.

The recommendation also includes up to $200,000 for the Midwest Assistance Program to develop a State water plan in Iowa. The plan will be developed under criteria established jointly with the Iowa Rural Water Association, the Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities, the Iowa section of the American Water Works Association, the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, and the Iowa Department of Economic Development.

The Committee is aware of several interests in the State of Arkansas for using funds under this account, including proposals from the city of Cotton Plant, the Delta Community Development Corp., and for establishing a regional farmers' market in eastern Arkansas through the direction of the Lower Mississippi River Delta Development Center. The recommendation includes funding for these projects.

The Olympic Peninsula has suffered great economic hardship and loss of jobs as a result of the timber supply crisis. Jefferson County and the Port Townsend School District in the State of Washington have developed a proposal to help workers and diversify the economy through the establishment of a Rural Economic Development Magnet Center. Up to $500,000 is included for this proposal. In addition, the Port of Ephrata in Washington State has a request before FmHA for funds for the extension of sewer facilities to the port in order to accommodate and encourage industrial development at the port. The Committee includes up to $500,000 for this project.

An amount up to $500,000 is provided for the Vermont State colleges to build additional job education and learning centers in remote areas of Vermont to link up using telecommunications.

The Committee does not concur with the House earmarks of $1,000,000 for Pennsylvania, $400,000 for Texas, and $350,000 for Virginia.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $1,500,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	1,500,000
Committee recommendation	3,000,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $20 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

Solid waste management grants are authorized by section 310B(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act for pollution abatement and control projects in rural areas.

Funds would be used to reduce or eliminate pollution of water resources and to improve planning and management of solid waste sites. Eligible activities under this section include: evaluation of current landfill conditions to determine threats to drinking water; technical assistance to help remedy failing solid waste landfill sites; and technical and financial assistance to help communities manage the reduction of their solid waste stream.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for solid waste management grants. This amount is $1,500,000 more than both the 1991 and House levels. No appropriation was requested by the administration. The management of solid waste poses an expensive and bewildering problem for many rural communities that lack the technical expertise to dispose properly of waste products. The rising costs of new landfill space, the rapid depletion of existing landfills, and the contamination of rural drinking water through improper solid waste disposal present vast costs to rural areas.

The Committee notes the need to provide technical assistance to dispose properly and manage waste in rural areas as a means to reduce the threat to water quality and human health and safety. The Committee is aware of an application submitted by Southern Arkansas University to develop technologies to dispose and manage animal waste. The Committee finds this application consistent with the intent of congressional authorization and expects the Department of Agriculture to give it strong consideration.

EMERGENCY COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $10,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $130 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

Emergency community water assistance grants are authorized by the Disaster Assistance Act of 1989 (Public Law 101–82). They are provided to assist rural communities that have had a significant decline in quantity or quality in their drinking water supply or their existing water system needs emergency repairs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for emergency community water assistance grants. This amount is the same as the 1991 level. The House included no funds, and none were requested in the budget. Due to the drought over the past few years in many parts of the country, rural areas' water supply has been seriously threatened. These funds will contribute significantly to the provision of safe water for rural residents.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $600,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	600,000
Committee recommendation	600,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $8 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The Office of the Administrator provides overall supervision and coordination for the programs of the Farmers Home Administration.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Administrator, the Committee recommends $600,000, the same as the 1991 and House levels. The President requested funds for this account under the "Salaries and expenses" account.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriation	Program accounts	Total
Appropriations, 1991	$439,854,000	$275,673,000	[1] $715,527,000
Budget estimate, 1992 [2]	40,270,000	$710,947,000	751,217,000
House allowance	37,637,000	710,947,000	748,584,000
Committee recommendation	38,959,000	711,266,000	750,225,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $5,718 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.
[2] $13,722,000 direct appropriation and $56,595,000 from program accounts was requested for the Rural Development Administration.

Under credit reform, administrative costs associated with loan programs are appropriated to the program accounts for the agriculture credit insurance fund and the rural housing insurance fund. Appropriations to the "Salaries and expenses" account will be for costs associated with grant programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For salaries and expenses, the Committee recommends a program level of $750,225,000. This amount is $34,698,000 more than the 1991 level, $992,000 less than the budget estimate, and $1,641,000 more than the House level.

Included in this amount is $4,300,000 for the circuit rider program, an increase of $1,401,000 over the 1991 level and $630,000 above the House allowance.

The Committee notes that $2,000,000 is provided in the budget request for the Small Farmer Training and Technical Assistance Program. The Committee provides for the continuation and expansion of this important program.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	.....
Budget estimate, 1992	$13,722,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends no funding for the Rural Development Administration [RDA]. The budget requested $13,722,000 for RDA to be transferred from FmHA. The House provided no funds.

Considerable concern has been expressed about the creation of a new agency and the associated costs. While the Committee supports the administration in its efforts to focus attention on rural development initiatives and programs, it notes that the budget request included reductions in several rural development programs. The Committee believes that program dollars are much more im-

portant for rural development than a new agency with no new programs. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary not to establish the Rural Development Administration, but rather, to use the existing funded programs within the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Extension Service, and other agencies to maximize development activities in rural areas.

The Committee urges the Department to develop regional rural development strategies which properly account for special or unique problems which may be commonly shared by identifiable geographic or multistate locations. It is expected these strategies will be developed in cooperation with State and local agencies. The Committee further expects FmHA to develop a rural development demonstration project in the region of the lower Mississippi River delta in 1992.

Rural Electrification Administration

The Rural Electrification Administration [REA] was established by Executive Order 7037 on May 11, 1935, to provide loan funds to eligible borrowers for the purpose of extending central station electric service to unserved persons in rural areas. Statutory provision for the agency was made in the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936. On July 1, 1939, under Reorganization Plan II, REA became a part of the Department of Agriculture. On October 28, 1949, the purpose of REA was expanded by Public Law 423 which amended the Act to authorize loans for furnishing telephone service to rural areas.

Public Law 93-32, enacted May 11, 1973, amended the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, by establishing a Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund [RETRF] for the purpose of making insured loans to REA electric and telephone borrowers. Loans made under this authority bear either 2- or 5-percent interest in accordance with criteria specified in the act, and have a maturity not to exceed 35 years. The act also authorized REA to guarantee loans made by other lenders at rates and terms agreed upon between the lender and the borrower. The rural electrification and telephone revolving fund legislation contains the following statement of congressional policy:

> * * * it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that adequate funds should be made available to rural electric and telephone systems through direct, insured, and guaranteed loans at interest rates which will allow them to achieve the objectives of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; and that such rural electric and telephone systems should be encouraged and assisted to develop their resources and ability to achieve the financial strength needed to enable them to satisfy their credit needs from their own financial organizations and other sources at reasonable rates and terms consistent with the loan applicant's ability to pay and achievement of the Act's objectives.

In October 1976, Public Law 94-570 amended the act, changing the statutory criteria used in determining eligibility for the special

interest rate (2 percent) insured loans. The change in criteria corrected unintended inequities resulting from Public Law 93–32, bringing the number of borrowers eligible for the special rate more in line with congressional intent and with borrowers' actual needs for loan funds at this rate.

On August 13, 1981, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, Public Law 97–35, was signed into law to further amend the Rural Electrification Act. This legislation changed the Rural Electrification Act by eliminating the special 2-percent interest rate on insured loans from the RETRF. It also provided that the Administrator may make insured loans at a rate less than 5 percent, but not less than 2 percent, if the borrower has experienced extreme financial hardship, or cannot provide service consistent with the objectives of the act without charging rates so high that a substantial disparity results between such rates and those charged for similar services in the same or nearby areas by other suppliers.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE REVOLVING FUND

	Loan level, 1991	Budget estimate, 1992	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Electric loans:				
REA insured [1]	$622,050,000	$504,958,000	$622,050,000	$622,050,000
FFB insured [2]	813,450,000		813,450,000	813,450,000
Private sector guarantees [1]		169,042,000	169,042,000	
Total, electric	1,435,500,000	674,000,000	1,604,542,000	1,435,500,000
Telephone loans:				
REA insured [3]	239,250,000	194,042,000	239,250,000	239,250,000
FFB insured [4]	119,625,000		119,625,000	119,625,000
Private sector guarantees [3]		64,958,000	64,958,000	
Total, telephone	358,875,000	259,000,000	423,833,000	358,875,000
Modified direct loans		493,700,000	493,700,000	493,700,000
Total, rural electrification and telephone revolving fund	1,794,375,000	1,426,700,000	2,522,075,000	2,288,075,000

[1] 1991 loan level does not reflect the Public Law 101–508 (Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) level of $485,453,000 for REA insured and $161,817,000 for private sector guarantees.
[2] Does not reflect sequester of $10,575 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.
[3] 1991 loan level does not reflect the Public Law 101–508 (Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) level of $186,547,000 for REA insured and $62,183,000 for private sector guarantees.
[4] Does not reflect sequester of $1,555 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For insured loans to rural electric systems, the Committee recommends $622,050,000. For insured telephone loans the Committee recommends $239,250,000. The House provided these amounts as floors and set ceilings of $933,075,000 for insured electric loans and $311,025,000 for insured telephone loans.

For insured loans through the Federal Financing Bank and guaranteed by REA, the Committee provides the following: Electric loan guarantees, $813,450,000; telephone loan guarantees, $119,625,000. The House provided these amounts as floors and set ceiling of $813,450,000 for electric guarantees and $119,625,000 for telephone guarantees.

The Committee has struck House bill language prohibiting the use of a general funds policy by REA. This provision, which had been included in previous appropriations acts, has been made permanent law by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990.

Bill language is recommended to prohibit the development or implementation of any other test, ratio, or criteria to deny or reduce loans or loan advances to borrowers. REA has proposed a means test for electric-insured loans with which the Committee does not agree.

The Committee has changed House bill language to prohibit the making of loans except to the extent provided in advance in appropriations acts.

RETRF PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	REA insured loan subsidy	FFB insured loan subsidy	Guaranteed loan subsidy	Total subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 1991					
Budget estimate, 1992	$127,866,000		$105,000	$127,971,000	$29,419,000
House allowance	229,967,000	$6,531,000	105,000	236,603,000	29,163,000
Committee recommendation	157,609,000	14,152,000		171,761,000	28,311,000

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 establishes the program account. An appropriation to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table reflects the cost of the loan programs under credit reform.

	1991 enacted	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Loan subsidies:				
Direct loans:				
Electric		$95,237,000	$166,087,000	$117,319,000
Telephone		32,629,000	63,880,000	40,290,000
Guaranteed loans:				
Electric		62,000	62,000	
Telephone		43,000	43,000	
REA-FFB loans			6,531,000	14,152,000
Total, loan subsidies		127,971,000	236,603,000	171,761,000
RETRF salaries and expenses		29,419,000	29,163,000	28,311,000

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK

DIRECT LOANS

Loan levels, 1991	[1] $177,045,000
Budget estimate, 1992	125,000,000
House allowance	177,045,000
Committee recommendation	177,045,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $2,302 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

Public Law 92–12, approved May 7, 1971, amended the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to establish the Rural Telephone Bank [RTB] as a supplemental source of financing the Rural Telephone Program. The Bank charges a single interest rate based on its average cost of money, but not less than 5 percent per annum. The Bank may borrow public or private funds in a total amount not to exceed 20 times its paid-in capital and retained earnings.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For Rural Telephone Bank loans, the Committee recommends a floor of $177,045,000 and a ceiling of $210,540,000. These levels are the same as in 1991 and as provided by the House. The President's budget proposed no more than $125,000,000 for these loans.

RTB PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Loan subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 1991		
Budget estimate, 1992	$2,563,000	$8,632,000
House allowance	11,331,000	8,632,000
Committee recommendation	3,629,000	8,392,000

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 establishes the program account. An appropriation to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the cost of providing loans through the Rural Telephone Bank, the Committee recommends $3,629,000, a decrease of $7,702,000 from the House level and an increase of $1,066,000 above the budget request. In addition, $8,392,000 is provided for administrative expenses, a decrease of $240,000 from both the House and budget request levels.

RURAL COMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENT FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOSSES

Appropriations, 1991	$1,264,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,264,000
House allowance	1,264,000
Committee recommendation	

The Rural Communication Development Fund was established pursuant to Secretary's memorandum No. 1988, approved May 22, 1979. The memorandum transferred certain financing authorities under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) from the Farmers Home Administration to the Rural Electrification Administration for the purpose of financing and administering community antenna television services to facilities in rural areas.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

To reimburse the Rural Communication Development Fund for interest subsidies and losses sustained in prior years, the Committee recommends no appropriation. Under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this appropriation for losses is no longer necessary. The House provided $1,264,000, the same as the 1991 and budget request levels.

DISTANCE LEARNING AND MEDICAL LINK PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1991	.....
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	$5,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

This program is authorized in the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to provide incentives for local telephone exchange carriers, rural community facilities, and rural residents to improve the quality of phone service, to provide access to advanced telecommunications services and computer networks, and to improve rural opportunities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends no funds for the distance learning and medical link programs. There was no budget request and the House provided $5,000,000.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUBACCOUNT

	Appropriation	Loans	Loan subsidy
Appropriations, 1991 [1]	$5,000,000	.....	.....
Budget estimate, 1992 [2]	.....	$4,800,000	$1,454,000
House allowance	.....	5,000,000	1,700,000
Committee recommendation	.....	8,406,000	2,546,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $65 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.
[2] Earnings generated by the interest differential on voluntary cushion of credit payments and repayments made by REA borrowers will be utilized for zero-interest loans.

Under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, an appropriation to this account for loan subsidy will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with loans obligated in 1992 and beyond.

The Rural Economic Development Subaccount was established by the Reconciliation Act of December 1987 (Public Law 100–203), which amended the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, by establishing a new section 313. Section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act (7 U.S.C. 901) established a cushion of credits payment program

and created the Rural Economic Development Subaccount. Section 313 authorizes the Administrator of REA to utilize funds in this subaccount to provide grants or zero interest loans to REA borrowers for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, including funding for feasibility studies, startup costs, and other reasonable expenses for the purpose of fostering rural economic development.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For loans authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, the Committee recommends $8,406,000, $3,406,000 more than the House amount and $3,606,000 more than the budget request. In 1991 a direct appropriation of $5,000,000 was provided for this program and an estimated $8,406,000 was available for loans. Therefore, the Committee recommendation is the same as in 1991. For the cost associated with making these loans, the Committee recommends $2,546,000, an increase of $846,000 above the House level and $1,092,000 more than the budget request. The Committee has deleted House bill language making these loans available until expended.

The Committee recognizes that under credit reform REA can no longer make loans from the receipts generated by the interest differential on cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act. However, the Committee expects REA to make grants as authorized in section 313 of at least $5,000,000, but no more than is available under the authorization.

The Committee expects a quarterly report on the operation of this subaccount, including the number and dollar amount of applications received, pending, approved, and rejected.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $229,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	256,000
Committee recommendation	243,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $3 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Administrator provides overall supervision and coordination for the programs of the Rural Electrification Administration under the law enacted by the Congress. Funding for this office includes salaries and expenses for the Administrator, the Confidential Assistant to the Administrator, and one secretary. All funds available to this office are contained in this appropriation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $243,000 for the Office of the Administrator. This amount is $13,000 less than the House level and $14,000 above the 1991 level. The budget proposes to fund this account under the "salaries and expenses" account.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Salaries and expense account	Program account	Total salaries and expenses
Appropriations, 1991 [1]	$32,826,000		$32,826,000
Budget estimate, 1992 [2]		$38,051,000	38,051,000
House allowance		37,795,000	37,795,000
Committee recommendation		36,703,000	36,703,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $427 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.
[2] Pursuant to the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 all costs, including administrative expenses, associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond will be reflected in the respective program account.

In addition to administering programs for making loans, assurance of feasibility and adequate security, and collections on loans, the REA staff furnishes management and technical assistance to borrowers for the purpose of protecting the Government's loan security, to assure that construction and operation of borrowers' systems conform to approved standards and that the electric and telephone systems continue providing reliable service on an area coverage basis.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $36,703,000. This amount is $3,877,000 more than the 1991 level, $1,348,000 less than the budget estimate, and $1,092,000 less than the House amount.

The Committee concurs with House bill language providing that not less than $500,000 of REA's salaries and expenses be used to provide technical economic development assistance to rural electric and telephone systems. The committee has included, however, a ceiling of $1,500,000 for this assistance. In addition, bill language is included prohibiting the reassignment or transfer of REA's responsibilities assigned by law to the Administrator.

TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $485,000
Budget estimate, 1992	574,000
House allowance	542,000
Committee recommendation	522,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $6 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's food and consumer activities. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Food and Nutrition Service, and Human Nutrition Information Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $522,000, $37,000 more than the 1991 amount, $52,000 less than the budget estimate, and $20,000 less than the House level.

Food and Nutrition Service

The Food and Nutrition Service was established August 8, 1969, by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1659 and Supplement 1 pursuant to the authority contained in 5 U.S.C. 301 and the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

The Food and Nutrition Service administers food assistance programs which provide access to a more nutritious diet for persons with low incomes and encourage better eating patterns among the Nation's children. The programs are:

Food Stamp Program.—Food stamps are issued to eligible low-income households to enable them to obtain a better diet by increasing their food purchasing power. The Food and Nutrition Service administers the program in cooperation with State welfare agencies and provides for the full cost of the food stamps themselves in addition to sharing direct and indirect administrative costs incurred by the States on a 50-50 basis. If, however, States reduce their error rates below the 5-percent level, they are eligible to receive enhanced administrative funding up to 60 percent. In addition, States receive 75 percent of their costs incurred for developing food stamp computer systems and 75 percent of their costs for fraud investigations and prosecutions. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation.

Child nutrition programs.—The child nutrition programs—the national school lunch, school breakfast, summer food service, and

child and adult care food programs—provide funding for the service of nutritious meals to needy children and other children attending schools, child care institutions, and summer recreational programs as a means of safeguarding the health and proper physical development of the Nation's children. The Older Americans Act Amendments of 1987, Public Law 100-175, made adult day care centers eligible for reimbursement through the child care food program for meals served to persons over 60 years of age or to chronically impaired disabled persons. The Food and Nutrition Service works through State agencies, providing them with cash and commodities for use in preparing and serving meals, and administers the various child nutrition programs directly in cases where the State has chosen not to administer the programs. Funds for these programs are provided by direct appropriation and transfer from section 32.

Special Milk Program.—The Special Milk Program provides funding for milk service in schools, nonprofit child care centers, and camps which have no other federally assisted food programs. Since the enactment of the Child Nutrition Amendments of 1986, this provision does not apply to split-session kindergartens where children do not have access to the federally assisted food programs. This milk is provided to children either free or at a low cost. The Food and Nutrition Service provides cash subsidies to State-administered programs and directly administers the program in States which have chosen not to administer the program. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation.

Special supplemental food program [WIC].—The Special Supplemental Food Program for women, infants, and children [WIC] provides supplemental food to pregnant, postpartum, and breast-feeding women; infants; and young children up to 5 years of age who are found to be at nutritional risk. State departments of health receive cash grants from the Food and Nutrition Service for this activity. State and local administrative costs are based on a national monthly per person administrative grant for the program. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation.

Commodity Supplemental Food Program.—The Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP] provides supplemental food to a target population similar to that of the WIC program and to the elderly at various locations. The foods, however, are purchased directly by the Department of Agriculture and distributed to eligible women, infants, and children up to 6 years of age through State and local agencies. The Food and Nutrition Service provides cash assistance to distributing agencies to offset their operating expenses at a rate of 15 percent of appropriated funding plus 15 percent of the value of commodities donated as part of the food package. Congress gave USDA authority to operate elderly feeding projects. Using CSFP local agency sites and various commodities provided through CSFP, these projects focus on volunteer delivery of food packages to homebound elderly persons. Funds for these programs are provided by direct appropriation.

Cash and commodities for selected groups.—The Food and Nutrition Service administers the Needy Family Program which provides nutritious agricultural commodities to eligible low-income households on or near Indian reservations and in the Trust Terri-

tory of the Pacific Islands. The program also helps to expand markets for food produced by American farmers. Monthly packages of USDA donated commodites are distributed to beneficiary households from local warehouse facilities. Participating agencies can order food items according to households' preferences. Participants receive information about nutrition, proper food storage, sanitary food preparation methods, and suggestions for using donated foods from nutritionists, county extension home economists, and other sources. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation.

The nutrition program for the elderly provides nutritious meals for elderly people. State agencies on aging designate area agencies on aging to plan and coordinate the nutrition program through local outlets. The State agencies on aging request USDA-donated foods, cash in lieu of food, or a combination of both to provide meals to the elderly at various sites. The amount of food or cash that USDA gives each State is based on the number of meals served in the program and the level of available funds. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation.

The commodity purchases for soup kitchens programs provides nutritious meals to needy homeless persons. State agencies are responsible for requesting USDA commodities only in quantities that can be efficiently used by public and charitable institutions which maintain an established feeding operation for the homeless. Storage and distribution of these commodities to local organizations are also the responsibility of the States. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriations.

Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico.—As a result of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, the Food and Nutrition Service now provides the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico with a nutrition assistance block grant, which gives the Commonwealth broader flexibility to establish a food assistance program specifically tailored to the needs of its low-income households. Beginning July 1, 1982, the Commonwealth has been providing food assistance to low-income households in the form of cash grants, rather than coupons. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 prohibited the use of cash for nutrition assistance in the Commonwealth after fiscal year 1983. Public Law 98–204, approved December 2, 1983, postponed the effective date of the noncash provision until October 1, 1985. The noncash provision was then deleted by the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–198).

Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP].—The Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program provides funding for the intrastate storage and distribution of USDA commodities. The funds are made available to State and local distributing organizations through grants administered by the Food and Nutrition Service.

Under this program, assistance may be provided through the distribution of commodities and cash subsidies to charitable institutions, food banks, hunger centers, soup kitchens, and similar nonprofit eligible recipient agencies providing nutrition assistance to relieve situations of emergency and distress through the provision of food to needy persons, including low-income and unemployed persons.

The allocation of commodities and administrative funds to the States is based upon a formula which considers the States' unemployment level and the number of persons with incomes below the poverty level.

Food Program administration.—This account provides for the salaries and operating expenses of the Food and Nutrition Service. Headquarters of the Service is at Park Office Center in Alexandria, VA. The Food and Nutrition Service maintains the following seven regional offices: Burlington, MA; Robbinsville, NJ; Atlanta, GA; Chicago, IL; Dallas, TX; Denver, CO; and San Francisco, CA.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

	Appropriation	Transfer from sec. 32	Total
Appropriations, 1991	$880,698,000	$4,696,501,000	$5,577,199,000
Budget estimate, 1992	1,389,711,000	4,675,092,000	6,064,803,000
House allowance	1,392,294,000	4,675,092,000	6,067,386,000
Committee recommendation	1,393,651,000	4,675,092,000	6,068,743,000

The child nutrition programs, authorized by the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, subsidize meals served to children. The programs reach children not only through schools but also through a variety of other institutions. The Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1987, Public Law 100–71, eliminated the tuition cap on any nonprofit private schools allowing all such schools to participate in the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act.

The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 1989, Public Law 101–147, contained a number of child nutrition provisions. These include:

Summer Food Service Program [SFSP].—Reauthorized and expanded SFSP to private, nonprofit organizations under certain conditions.

School Breakfast Program [SBP].—Provided start-up grants for programs serving low-income children.

Child and Adult Care Food Program [CACFP].—Provided funds for demonstration projects to expand services to homeless children and family day-care homes in low-income areas.

National School Lunch Program [NSLP].—(1) Mandated unified system for compliance and accountability which would integrate Federal and State efforts and provide for increased Federal monitoring of SFSP operations; (2) authorized the Food Service management Institute to improve school food service operations.

Nutrition Education and Training [NET].—Required demonstration projects and studies to examine a number of program issues and increased the authorization level. A general description of the programs follows:

1. Cash payments to States.—The programs are operated under an agreement entered into by the State agencies and the Department. Funds are made available under letters of credit to State agencies for use in reimbursing participating schools and other institutions. Sponsors make application to the State agencies, and if

approved, are reimbursed on a per-meal basis in accordance with the terms of their agreements and rates prescribed by law. The reimbursement rates are adjusted annually to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for Food Away From Home.

(a) School Lunch Program.—Assistance is provided to the States for the service of lunches to all school children, regardless of family income. States must match some of the Federal cash grant. In fiscal year 1991, the School Lunch Program will provide assistance for serving an estimated 4.1 billion school lunches including 2.1 billion for children from upper-income families and 2 billion for children from lower and low-income families. Schools which, in the second previous fiscal year, served at least 60 percent of their lunches at free or reduced prices receive an additional 2 cents per meal assistance. An estimated 25 million children are expected to participate in the program daily during the school year.

(b) Special assistance for free and reduced price lunches.—Additional assistance is provided to the States for serving lunches free or at a reduced price to needy children. In fiscal year 1991 under current law, the program will provide assistance for about 2 billion lunches, of which 1.7 billion will be served free of charge and 300 million at reduced price. Over 12 million needy children will participate in the program on an average school day during the year.

(c) School Breakfast Program.—Federal reimbursement to the States is based on the number of breakfasts served free, at a reduced price, or at the general rate for those served to nonneedy children. Certain schools, designated in severe need, because, in the second preceding year, they served at least 40 percent of their lunches at free or reduced prices and because the regular breakfast reimbursement is insufficient to cover costs, receive higher rates of reimbursement in both the free and reduced price categories. In fiscal year 1991, the program will serve an estimated 743 million breakfasts to a daily average of over 4 million children.

(d) State administrative expenses.—The funds may be used for State employee salaries, benefits, support services, and office equipment. Public Law 95–627 made the State administrative expenses grant equal to 1½ percent of certain Federal payments in the second previous year. In fiscal year 1991, $63,746,000 will be allocated among the States to fund ongoing State administrative expenses and to improve the management of the various nutrition programs. The Child Nutrition Amendments of 1986 authorize the use of up to three pilot projects to evaluate the benefits of contracting out for the administration of the child nutrition programs in States where the Food and Nutrition Service currently administers these programs.

(e) Summer Food Service Program.—Meals served free to children in low-income neighborhoods during the summer months are supported on a performance basis by Federal cash subsidies to State agencies. Funds are also provided for related State and local administrative expenses. During the summer of 1991, approximately 95 million meals will be served.

(f) Child and Adult Care Food Program.—Preschool children receive year-round food assistance in nonprofit child care centers and family and group day care homes under this program. Public Law 97–35 permits profitmaking child care centers receiving compensation under title XX of the Social Security Act to participate in the program if 25 percent of the children served are title XX participants. Certain adult day-care centers are also eligible for participation in this program, providing subsidized meals to nonimpaired individuals age 60 years or older. The Child and Adult Care Food Program reimburses State agencies at varying rates for breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and meal supplements and for program-related State audit expenses. In fiscal year 1991, approximately 1.2 billion meals will be served.

2. Commodity procurement.—Commodities are purchased for distribution to the School Lunch, Child Care Food, and Summer Food Service Programs. The minimum commodity support rate for all school lunch and child care center lunches and suppers served is mandated by law and adjusted annually on July 1 to reflect changes in the producer price index for food used in schools and institutions. The commodities purchased with these funds are supplemented by commodities purchased with section 32 funds.

3. Nutrition studies and education.—

(a) Nutrition studies and surveys.—In fiscal year 1991, the funds appropriated for this purpose will be used for several studies to provide descriptive and evaluative information about the programs. This information will aid in making informed decisions and improving program operations.

(b) Nutrition education and training.—Public Law 95–166 instituted a program of grants to the States for nutrition education in schools. In fiscal year 1991, $7,500,000 will be made available to the States for nutrition education and training.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the child nutrition programs, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,393,651,000 plus transfers from section 32 of $4,675,092,000 for a total program of $6,068,743,000. This amount is $491,544,000 more than the fiscal year 1991 program level, $3,940,000 more than the budget request, and $1,357,000 more than the House level.

The Committee's recommendation provides for the child nutrition programs at the following annual rates:

TOTAL OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

Child nutrition programs	1991 appropriation	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
School Lunch Program	$3,380,676,000	$3,622,973,000	$3,622,973,000	$3,622,973,000
School Breakfast Program	638,996,000	721,924,000	721,924,000	721,924,000
State administrative expenses	63,746,000	69,852,000	69,852,000	69,852,000
Summer Food Service Program	179,957,000	196,164,000	196,164,000	196,164,000
Child and Adult Care Food Program	1,045,346,000	1,211,589,000	1,211,589,000	1,211,589,000
Commodity procurement	253,097,000	226,573,000	226,573,000	226,573,000
Nutrition studies and surveys	3,085,000	3,085,000	3,085,000	3,085,000
Nutrition education and training	7,500,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

TOTAL OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY—Continued

Child nutrition programs	1991 appropriation	1992 budget	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Federal review system	3,653,000	6,500,000	4,083,000	4,083,000
Food Service Management Institute	1,143,000	1,143,000	1,143,000	1,500,000
Total available	5,577,199,000	6,064,803,000	6,067,386,000	6,068,743,000

The Committee concurs with the House in providing an increase of $2,500,000 for the Nutrition Education and Training [NET] Program to provide nutrition guidance to teachers, school food service personnel, parents, and children. The increase will enhance the health promotion and disease prevention activities of this program.

For the Federal review system, the Committee recommends $4,083,000, the same as the House, $430,000 above the 1991 level, and $2,417,000 less than recommended in the budget. An increase is not provided to extend Federal review efforts to the Child and Adult Care Food Program.

The Committee recommends an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request and the House level for nutrition studies and surveys. These funds will be used to conduct a comprehensive school lunch study as authorized by section 1779 of 1990 farm bill. The Committee also recommends $1,500,000, an increase of $357,000 for the Food Service Management Institute in Mississippi.

The Committee is aware of reports from some school food services of the limited availability of dairy bonus commodities other than butter, such as cheese and nonfat dry milk. The Committee urges the Food and Nutrition Service to make every effort to ensure that these commodities are available to schools in sufficient quantities and on a regular basis to enable them to plan ahead adequately to meet the nutritional needs of the Nation's schoolchildren.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	$19,268,000
Budget estimate, 1992	23,011,000
House allowance	23,011,000
Committee recommendation	23,011,000

The Special Milk Program is authorized by section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended. It subsidizes institutions for milk consumed by students in nonprofit schools of high school grade or under, summer camps, and similar institutions that do not participate in another meal service program authorized by the Child Nutrition Act or the National School Lunch Act. Effective October 1, 1986, based on authority in Public Law 99-661, children in split session kindergarten programs in nonprofit schools who do not have access to the meal service programs operating in those schools may participate in the Special Milk Program.

In fiscal year 1991 approximately 209 million half-pints will be served in the Special Milk Program. These include about 197 million half-pints served to children whose family income is above 130 percent of poverty and about 12 million half-pints served free to children whose family income is at or below 130 percent of poverty.

During fiscal year 1991, the average full cost reimbursement for milk served to needy children is expected to be 16.6 cents for each half-pint. Milk served to nonneedy children is expected to be reimbursed at 10.88 cents for each half-pint.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Special Milk Program, the Committee has recommended $23,011,000 to fund the program fully in those institutions which are eligible. This amount is $3,743,000 more than the 1991 level and the same as both the budget request and the House level.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN [WIC]

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $2,350,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,573,400,000
House allowance	2,600,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,573,400,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $65 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] is authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The program makes funds available to local health clinics through State departments of health and to Indian tribes to provide supplemental foods to low-income pregnant, postpartum, and breast-feeding women, infants and children up to 5 years of age who are determined by competent medical or nutritional professionals to be at nutritional risk. In fiscal year 1991 the program funds are expected to support an average monthly participation of 4.7 million participants at an average cost of $41.41 per person per month.

The WIC program food packages are designed to provide foods which studies have demonstrated are lacking in the diets of the WIC program target population. The authorized supplemental foods are iron-fortified infant formula, infant cereal, milk, cheese, eggs, iron-fortified breakfast cereal, fruit or vegetable juice which contains vitamin C, dry beans and peas, and peanut butter.

There are three general types of delivery systems for WIC foods: (1) retail purchase in which participants obtain supplemental foods through retail stores; (2) home delivery systems in which food is delivered to the participant's home; and (3) direct distribution systems in which participants pick up food from a distribution outlet. The food is free of charge to all participants.

The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 1989, Public Law 101-147, changed the administrative formula for State program administrative costs from 20 percent of total available funds to a national monthly per person administrative grant associated with the WIC Program. These costs include certifying participant eligibility, food delivery, and warehousing, monitoring, nutrition education, outreach, startup cost, and general administration by the State agency. Not less than one-sixth of these administrative funds must be used for nutrition education activities.

Public Law 101-147 makes one-half of 1 percent of program funds, not to exceed $5,000,000 available to the Secretary for evaluation of program performance.

Public Law 101–147 also contains cost containment initiatives to expand participation. (1) It required State agencies with retail food delivery systems to use a competitive bidding system or a system with equal savings for the procurement of infant formula. Savings are to be used to expand program participation. (2) It permitted States with an approved cost containment system to use first quarter funds to cover obligations incurred during the fourth quarter of the preceding fiscal year.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC], the Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,573,400,000. This amount is $223,400,000 more than the 1991 appropriation, the same as the budget estimate, and $26,600,000 less than the House level.

The Committee concurs with the House in expecting the Department to evaluate State competitive bidding practices and to work closely with States to ensure that their request for proposals are uniform and provide a fair and equitable chance to all eligible formula manufacturers. The Committee expects the Department to report its findings to the appropriate committees of Congress no later than December 31, 1991.

The Food and Nutrition Service, as required by the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 1989 (Public Law 101–147), is reviewing the appropriateness of foods eligible for purchase through WIC, including cereals containing sugar. However, it should be noted, that WIC legislation directs the Secretary to limit the amount of sugar in the WIC food package. The WIC advisory committee is directly involved in this review. The Committee expects to receive the final report on this review which will be submitted to Congress no later than June 30, 1992.

The Committee concurs with the House in expecting the Department to continue to work with the States to minimize any impact decreases in infant formula rebate bids may have on program participation. In that light, the Committee expects that the Secretary will consider any request to waive the requirements of competitive bidding for the procurement of infant formula, if bids received by a WIC agency provide lower rebates than the preceding year's contract, if the State WIC agency can provide infant formula at a lower price than through the competitive bidding process, and if it would result in a significant reduction in program participants.

The Committee recommends bill language providing up to $5,000,000 for the farmers market program, an increase of $2,250,000 over the grants awarded to demonstration projects in 1991.

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM [CSFP]

Appropriations, 1991	$81,928,000
Budget estimate, 1992	85,369,000
House allowance	91,284,000
Committee recommendation	88,318,000

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP] is authorized by section 4(a) of the Agricultural and Consumer Protection

Act of 1973, as amended in 1981 by Public Law 97-98. This program provides supplemental foods to infants and children up to age 6 and to pregnant, postpartum, and breast-feeding women and to senior citizens who have low incomes and are residing in approved project areas.

In fiscal year 1991 approximately 222,000 women, infants, and young children and 109,000 elderly are authorized to receive food packages each month. The foods are provided by the Department of Agriculture for distribution through State agencies. The authorized commodities are iron-fortified infant formula, rice cereal, canned juice, evaported milk and/or nonfat dry milk, canned vegetables or fruits, canned meat or poultry, egg mix, dehydrated potatoes, farina, and peanut butter or dry beans. Elderly participants may receive all commodities except iron-fortified infant formula and rice cereal.

States are given 15 percent of the Federal funds appropriated and, according to the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198), enacted December 23, 1985, 15 percent of the value of donated commodities to cover administrative costs. Allowable administrative costs include nutrition education, warehousing, food delivery, participant certification, and other costs associated with State and local administration of the program.

The Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-98) authorized the institution of two pilot commodity distribution projects directed at low-income elderly persons. Detroit, MI, and Des Moines, IA, were selected as pilot sites. A third project, authorized by the 1983 Agriculture Appropriations Act (Public Law 97-370) was established in New Orleans, LA, in December 1982. The Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198) authorized all CSFP sites to serve the elderly.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP], the Committee recommends an appropriation of $88,318,000, $6,390,000 more than the 1991 level, $2,949,000 more than the budget request, and $2,966,000 less than the House level.

The Committee is aware of the Department's position that, due to unexpected carryover funds, the budget request for CSFP will not result in a reduction to the elderly caseload, contrary to estimates when the budget was submitted at the beginning of the year. This carryover is due to lower-than-projected food costs, as well as lower-than-projected participation by women and children.

In the past, the Committee has directed that unused funds should be used to expand elderly caseloads and approve applications for additional CSFP sites. The Committee is aware of expanded caseload requests for both women and children and elderly programs. Therefore, an increase is provided to meet current needs and to meet this expansion directive.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

	Expenses	Subject to budget request	Puerto Rico	Total
Appropriations, 1991	$17,453,168,000	$2,123,513,000	$974,220,000	$20,550,901,000
Budget estimate, 1992	19,649,975,000	2,500,000,000	1,013,000,000	23,162,975,000
House allowance	19,649,975,000	1,500,000,000	1,013,000,000	22,162,975,000
Committee recommendation	19,649,975,000	3,000,000,000	1,013,000,000	23,662,975,000

The Food Stamp Program, which is authorized through September 30, 1995, by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990, helps individuals and families with low incomes to obtain a more nutritious diet. Eligible participants are entitled to food stamp allotments based on their household size and net income after provision has been made for certain deductions. The food stamps increase the food purchasing power of eligible households and thus enable them to attain a better diet than would have been possible without the assistance of the Food Stamp Program.

The Food Stamp Program is currently in operation in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. Participating households receive food stamps whose value is determined by household size and income. The cost of the stamps is paid by the Federal Government and is called benefit cost. As required by law, the food stamp allotments for the various household sizes are periodically revised to reflect changes in the cost of the thrifty food plan. The last revision was made on October 1, 1990.

The State social service agencies are responsible for certifying eligible households and issuing the food stamps. Authorized grocery stores accept the stamps as payment for food purchases and forward them to commercial banks for cash or credit. The stamps flow through the banking system to the Federal Reserve Bank for redemption out of a special account maintained by the U.S. Treasury Department.

In fiscal year 1991 an average of approximately 21.8 million persons are expected to participate in the program monthly and receive stamps worth an average of $63.52 each month.

NUTRITION ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97–35) authorized a block grant for nutrition assistance to Puerto Rico which gives the Commonwealth broad flexibility to establish a food assistance program that is specifically tailored to the needs of its low-income households. However, the Commonwealth must submit its annual plan of operation to the Secretary for approval. The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624), enacted November 5, 1990, reauthorizes appropriations through fiscal year 1995. In addition to the provision of direct benefits to the needy, a portion of the grant may be used to fund up to 50 percent of the costs of administering the program. The grant may also be used to fund projects to improve agriculture and food distribution in Puerto Rico.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Since October 1, 1984, all direct and indirect administrative costs incurred for certification of nonpublic assistance households, issuance of food stamps, quality control, and fair hearing efforts have been shared by the Federal Government and the States on a 50–50 basis. States may receive 60 percent Federal funding of administrative costs if their error rates are below 6 percent and a reasonable rate of invalid decisions is attained. Under the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988, a State agency is held liable if its error rate of overissuances and payments to ineligible households plus its rate for underissuances exceeds the lowest ever achieved national error rate average plus 1 percent. Liabilities are based on the level of State issuance and the extent to which the State's error rate exceeds a tolerance level. Federal funding for 63 percent of automation costs incurred by State agencies is authorized by law.

State administration also includes State antifraud activities. Under the provisions of the Food Stamp Act of 1977, States are eligible to be reimbursed for not less than 75 percent of the costs of their food stamp fraud investigations and prosecutions. Of the funds appropriated for State administration, $77,927,000 has been budgeted to cover State antifraud activities in fiscal year 1991.

States are required to implement an employment and training program for the purpose of assisting members of households participating in the Food Stamp Program in gaining skills, training, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment. In fiscal year 1987, the Department of Agriculture implemented a new grant program to States to assist them in providing employment and training services. The Department will pay the States at least $153,469,000 to operate work programs in fiscal year 1991.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Food Stamp Program, the Committee recommends $23,662,975,000, $3,112,074,000 more than the 1991 level, $500,000,000 more than the President's budget request, and $1,500,000,000 more than the House amount.

The Committee has provided that $3,000,000,000 of the appropriation shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount, is transmitted to the Congress. The House recommended $1,500,000,000 for this cushion. The budget request provided a cushion of $2,500,000,000. The Committee is aware of current estimates that already show that more than $1,700,000,000 of this cushion will be needed.

Included in the recommendation is up to $5,000,000 to fund outreach programs to food stamp recipients as authorized by section 1759 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990. Also included is $500,000 for the electronic benefit transfer program and food stamp strike force programs as proposed in the budget.

For the Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico Program, the Committee recommends $1,013,000,000, the same as the budget request and the House and $38,780,000 more than the 1991 level. The Committee concurs with the House in retaining the Food Stamp Pro-

gram and the Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico Program in a single account. Also, the Committee concurs with the House in providing $10,825,000 for the cattle tick eradication project in Puerto Rico—the same level available in 1991.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS FOR SELECTED GROUPS

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $260,138,000
Budget estimate, 1992	265,019,000
House allowance	265,437,000
Committee recommendation	257,143,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $2,966 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The food donations programs for selected groups appropriation funds the food distribution program on Indian reservations; the continuation of food assistance to residents of the Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; and the nutrition program for the elderly.

Food distribution programs on Indian reservations and in the Pacific Islands.—The Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 authorized the distribution of agricultural commodities to eligible needy persons residing on or near Indian reservations or in the Trust Territories of the Pacific. The act requires that a food distribution program be established on an Indian reservation if an Indian tribal organization [ITO] requests the program. If the ITO is capable of administering the program, it may do so in lieu of administration by a State agency. Public Law 97-98 authorized low-income Indian households residing in Oklahoma and not living on a reservation to participate in the program.

The Compact of Free Association Act of 1985 as amended and the compact approved by the peoples of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands established them as freely associated States. For transition purposes, food assistance will continue in fiscal year 1989 but at reduced levels, except in the nuclear affected zones of Bikini and Enewetak, as prescribed in the act. Food assistance for Palau will continue at normal levels until the residents of Palau approve their compact.

In fiscal year 1991 participation in the food distribution program on Indian reservations is expected to average about 143,000 per month. It is estimated that 2,875 residents of the former trust territories will receive food assistance in fiscal year 1991.

The foods made available to the distributing agencies include canned meat, fruit, vegetables and juice, flour, rice, evaporated milk, dry milk, and shortening. To the extent that surplus price-support commodities are available and can be used and not wasted, the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] donates them for use in this program. In fiscal year 1991 the value of the food package distributed on Indian reservations will average about $37.95 per person per month. The cost of the package includes 2.97 dollars' worth of commodities donated by CCC.

Cash payments are made to distributing agencies to assist them in meeting the administrative expenses incurred in operating a food distribution program. Included among these costs are local warehousing and transportation of commodities, utilities, salaries, and equipment.

Nutrition program for the elderly.—Commodity support for the nutrition program for the elderly is authorized by titles III and VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965. The foods provided are used in preparing meals which are served in senior citizen centers and similar settings or delivered to the home-bound elderly. These meals are the focal point of the nutrition projects for the elderly which have the dual objectives of promoting better health and reducing the isolation of old age.

Currently, commodities or cash in lieu of commodities are distributed through State agencies to the local meal sites at a specific rate per meal set by law. Public Law 100–175 set the rate at 56.76 cents per meal through fiscal year 1991. Some States elect to take all of their subsidy in cash and some States choose to receive a combination of cash and commodities. The commodities made available to the nutrition program for the elderly are generally the same as those provided to schools under the child nutrition programs.

Although originally a program to distribute nutritious surplus commodities to senior meal sites, the program evolved into a cash subsidy program. Almost 94 percent of program resources are distributed to meal providers in cash, on a per meal reimbursement basis.

Commodity purchases for soup kitchens.—The Hunger Prevention Act of 1988 authorizes the purchase and distribution of 40,000,000 dollars' worth of commodities to soup kitchens and food banks in fiscal year 1990. Commodities are distributed to the States which, in turn, provide them to public and charitable institutions which provide food to needy homeless persons on a regular basis as an integral part of their activities.

Distribution of commodities and payments for storage are the responsibility of State distribution agencies. States are responsible for requesting commodities only in quantities that can be efficiently used by these institutions, managing the distribution of commodities to local organizations, and ensuring that the organizations comply with all Federal program regulations and requirements. In addition, States are responsible for allocating administrative funds received under The Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP] to TEFAP emergency feeding organizations, soup kitchens, and food banks.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the food donations programs for selected groups, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $257,143,000. This amount is $2,995,000 less than the 1991 appropriation, $7,876,000 less than the budget request, and $8,294,000 less than the House level. Of this amount, $82,108,000 is for the food distribution program on Indian reservations and the Pacific islands, $143,035,000 is for expansion of the elderly feeding program, and $32,000,000 is for the purchase of additional commodities for soup kitchens and food banks.

The Committee provides $581,000 for the continuation of assistance traditionally provided to the nuclear-affected atolls of Bikini, Enewetak, Rongelap, and Utrik (parts of the Republic of the Mar-

shall Islands). The House provided $418,000; there was no budget request; and the 1991 level was $581,000.

For the Elderly Feeding Program, 245,000,000 meals were served in 1990. The current estimate of meals served in 1991 is 248,000,000. The Committee has provided sufficient funds to provide 252,000,000 meals in 1992.

THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $170,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	147,000,000
House allowance	170,000,000
Committee recommendation	165,000,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $2,210 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

Title II of Public Law 98-8, enacted March 3, 1983, authorized and appropriated funds for costs of intrastate storage and transportation of CCC commodities donated to families. The Hunger Prevention Act of 1988 authorized $50,000,000 for this purpose in fiscal year 1990 and $120,000,000 for the purchase and distribution of additional commodities high in nutrient content.

Funds are administered by the Food and Nutrition Service through grants to State agencies which operate commodity distribution programs. Allocation of the funds to States is based on a formula which considers the States' unemployment rates and the number of persons with incomes below the poverty level.

In fiscal year 1990, over 118,900,000 dollars' worth of surplus commodities were distributed to assist needy individuals. Donations continue in fiscal year 1991. Precise levels depend upon the availability of surplus commodities and requirements regarding market displacement.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the emergency food assistance program [TEFAP], the Committee recommends an appropriation of $165,000,000. This amount is $5,000,000 less than the House and the 1991 level, and $18,000,000 more than the budget request. Of this amount, $45,000,000 is provided for storage and intrastate distribution expenses.

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION [FPA]

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $96,778,000
Budget estimate, 1992	113,856,000
House allowance	101,617,000
Committee recommendation	105,453,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $1,258 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

Federal expenses associated with administration of the Food and Nutrition Service [FNS] programs are provided in the FPA appropriation. These expenses involve program and policy development, program monitoring, assistance to State agencies which actually operate the programs and general management support. Costs directly associated with delivery of benefits to participants are generally shared with the States and are funded from the individual program appropriations. Direct Federal operation of programs is provided through the FPA appropriation only in certain cases where a

State is prohibited by law from disbursing program funds or where no State agency has assumed administrative responsibility.

The following programs are administered by FNS: Child Nutrition Programs, Special Milk Program, Special Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC], Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP], Food Stamp Program, Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico, and the Cash and Commodities for Selected Groups.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For food program administration, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $105,453,000. This amount is $8,675,000 more than the 1991 level, $3,836,000 more than the House level, and $8,403,000 less than the budget request.

HUMAN NUTRITION INFORMATION SERVICE

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $9,923,000
Budget estimate, 1992	12,654,000
House allowance	11,255,000
Committee recommendation	9,788,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $129 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Human Nutrition Information Service [HNIS] was established October 1, 1981, by the Secretary's Memorandum No. 1000-1 issued pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 (7 U.S.C. 2201). The functions of this agency were formerly carried out in the Agricultural Research Service. HNIS activities fall into one major category: Research, analysis, and technical assistance which is concerned with the conduct and interpretation of applied research in human nutrition to improve professional and public understanding of the nutritional adequacy of diets and food supplies. It is also concerned with the nutritive value of food and the development of knowledge needed to improve the nutritional quality of diets, thereby improving the general health of the American public.

The agency has primary responsibility for the Department's role in the National Nutrition Monitoring System and in formulating dietary guidelines for healthy Americans. It is the primary national resource for information on the nutritive value of foods.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Human Nutrition Information Service, the Committee recommends $9,788,000, $2,866,000 less than the budget estimate, $135,000 less than the level provided in 1991, and $1,467,000 less than the House level.

The recommendation includes a reduction of $500,000 from the 1991 level for the Pesticide Data Program and an increase of $365,000 for pay costs. The Committee expects responsibilities under the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 to be carried out from within available funds.

TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $105,048,000
Budget estimate, 1992	109,523,000
House allowance	110,023,000
Committee recommendation	106,626,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $1,372 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

The Foreign Agricultural Service [FAS] was established on March 10, 1953, by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1320, supplement 1. Public Law 690, approved August 28, 1954, transferred the agricultural attachés from the Department of State to the Foreign Agricultural Service.

The agency maintains a worldwide agricultural intelligence and reporting service to provide U.S. farmers and traders with information on world agricultural production and trade that they can use to adjust to changes in world demand for U.S. agricultural products. This is accomplished through a continuous program of reporting by 73 posts located throughout the world covering some 108 countries.

The Foreign Agricultural Service analyzes agricultural information essential to the assessment of foreign supply and demand conditions in order to provide estimates of the current situation and to forecast the export potential for specific U.S. agricultural commodities. Published economic data about commodities are combined with attaché reports and subjected to analysis through advanced econometric techniques to generate these estimates.

In addition, the Service is now using advanced techniques for identifying, delineating, and assessing the impact of events which may affect the condition and expected production of foreign crops of economic importance to the United States. The crop condition activity relies heavily on computer-aided analysis of satellite, meteorological, agricultural, and related data.

The mission of FAS overseas is to represent U.S. agricultural interests, to promote export of domestic farm products, improve world trade conditions, and report on agricultural production and trade in foreign countries. FAS staff are stationed at foreign embassies in over 100 countries around the world where they provide expertise in agricultural economics and marketing, as well as provide attaché services.

The Foreign Agricultural Service works in conjunction with market development cooperators, trade associations, State departments of agriculture and their affiliates, and U.S. sales teams to develop foreign markets for U.S. farm products. FAS sponsors overseas trade exhibits to promote U.S. agricultural products, provides information about foreign importers, and performs a wide range of market development activities.

The Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198) as amended by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 authorized several export assistance programs to counter the adverse effects of unfair trade practices by competitors on U.S. agricultural trade. The Export Enhancement Program uses CCC-owned commodities as export bonuses to provide export enhancements to U.S. producers. The Market Promotion Program [MPP] conducts both generic and brand-identified promotional programs in conjunction with nonprofit agricultural associations and private firms financed through reimbursable CCC payments.

These programs are supplemented by the Cooperator Program, a joint FAS-nonprofit private trade and producer association partnership program developing strategies for U.S. agriculture export expansion. Nonprofit private trade and producer associations have generated an estimated $960,000,000 in contributions to more than match the $508,000,000 contributed by FAS to finance overseas market promotion activities under the Cooperator Program. In addition, GSM credit guarantee programs play an integral role in the recent progress of American agriculture in the world marketplace.

The Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 includes authority to establish up to 25 agricultural trade offices. Currently, 13 such offices are in operation at key foreign trading centers to assist U.S. exporters, trade groups, and State export marketing officials in trade promotion.

The Service initiates, directs, and coordinates the Department's formulation of trade policies and programs with the goal of maintaining and expanding world markets for U.S. agricultural products. It monitors international compliance with bilateral and multilateral trade agreements. It identifies restrictive tariff and trade practices which act as barriers to the import of U.S. agricultural commodities, then supports negotiations to remove them. It acts to counter and eliminate unfair trade practices by other countries that hinder U.S. agricultural exports to third markets.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $106,626,000. This amount is $1,578,000 more than the 1991 amount, $2,897,000 less than the budget estimate, and $3,397,000 less than the House level.

The Committee provides $225,000, the same as in 1991, for a cooperative agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Agriculture under the FAS cooperator program for the promotion and marketing of tropical and subtropical products.

The Committee directs the Foreign Agricultural Service [FAS] to continue to work, in conjunction with the Agricultural Marketing Service, to expand the level of exports for sunflower seed and cottonseed oil. Progress in promoting exports of these oils will positively impact American production.

The Committee is aware of AgriTechnics International [ATI], which has been developed by the Palouse Economic Development Council and other governmental entities in the State of Washington. The Committee will expect the agency to cooperate with ATI on programs that are of mutual benefit.

The 1990 farm bill directed FAS to provide for expanded utilization of FAS field representatives in an expanded Attaché Educational Program through the United States. The Committee includes an increase of $250,000 for this program to be carried out at the Albers Mill Building in Portland, OR.

The recommendation also includes an increase of $200,000 to enhance the Department's expertise in fish and shellfish products and to promote fish export markets.

In administering the Market Promotion Program [MPP], the Committee will expect the Department to allocate up to $500,000 of any funds made available for peanuts under MPP to allow the Georgia Department of Agriculture to establish, in cooperation with peanut grower groups and processors, a peanut marketing program in Eastern Europe. In addition, up to $1,200,000 of any MPP funds made available for pecans should be allocated for the National Pecan Marketing Board established by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to use in developing its international export program.

AMERI FLORA '92 EXPOSITION

Appropriations, 1991	$500,000
Budget estimate, 1992	
House allowance	500,000
Committee recommendation	

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends no appropriation for Ameri Flora '92 Exposition. The House provided $500,000, the same amount as was provided in 1991, and there was no budget request.

PUBLIC LAW 480

TITLE I PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Program level	Loan level	Loan subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 1991 [1]	$880,000,000	$806,400,000		
Budget estimate, 1992	463,800,000	417,420,000	$316,826,000	$1,847,000
House allowance	570,800,000	513,800,000	389,979,000	1,979,000
Committee recommendation	563,804,000	511,619,000	388,319,000	1,800,000

[1] In 1991, titles I and III were funded jointly and an appropriation of $314,853,000 was provided.

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 establishes the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with direct loans obligated in 1992 and beyond, as will as for administrative expenses.

Financing sales of agricultural commodities to developing countries for dollars on credit terms, or for local currencies (including for local currencies on credit terms) for use under section 104; and for furnishing commodities to carry out the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended (title I).—Title I of the legislation authorizes financing of sales to developing countries for local currencies and for dollars on credit terms. Sales for dollars or local currency may be made to foreign governments, or to United States and foreign pri-

vate trade entities. The legislation provides for repayment terms either in local currencies or U.S. dollars on credit terms of up to 30 years, with a grace period of up to 7 years.

Local currencies under title I sales agreements may be used in carrying out activities under section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. Activities in the receipt country for which these local currencies may be used include developing new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, paying U.S. obligations, and supporting agricultural development and research.

Title I appropriated funds may also be used under the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, to furnish commodities on credit terms or on a grant basis to assist developing countries and countries that are emerging democracies that have a commitment to introduce and expand free enterprise elements in their agricultural economies.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For Public Law 480, title I, the Committee recommends a program level of $563,804,000, a decrease of $6,996,000 from the House level and an increase of $100,004,000 above the budget request. The corresponding loan levels, subsidies and administrative expenses are reflected in the table above. In 1991, titles I and III were funded together at a program level of $880,000,000.

GRANT ACCOUNT— (TITLE I OCEAN FREIGHT DIFFERENTIAL, TITLE II AND TITLE III)

Appropriations, 1991 (title II only)	$696,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	982,580,000
House allowance	1,007,959,000
Committee recommendation	1,137,923,000

Ocean freight differential costs in connection with commodities sales financed for local currencies or U.S. dollars (title I).—The corporation pays ocean freight differential costs on shipments under this title. These costs are the difference between foreign flag and U.S.-flag shipping costs.

Commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad (title II)(7 U.S.C. 1721-1726).—Commodities are supplied without cost through foreign governments to combat malnutrition, and to meet famine and other emergency requirements. Commodities are also supplied for nonemergencies through public private agencies, including intergovernmental organizations. The corporation pays ocean freight on shipments under this title, and may also pay overland transportation costs to a landlocked country, as well as internal distribution costs in emergency situations. A minimum of $10,000,000 but not more than $13,500,000 of the funds appropriated for title II must be made available to private voluntary organizations and cooperatives to assist these organizations in meeting administrative and related costs.

Commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad (title III).—Commodities are supplied without cost to least developed countries through foreign governments for direct feeding, development of emergency food reserves, or may be sold with the pro-

ceeds of such sale used by the recipient country for specific economic development purposes. The corporation may pay ocean freight on shipments under this title, and may also pay overland transportation costs to a landlocked country, as well as internal distribution costs.

PUBLIC LAW 480 GRANT ACCOUNT

	1991 Appropriation	1992 Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Title I ocean freight differential		$46,380,000	$57,000,000	$52,185,000
Title II commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad	$696,000,000	627,000,000	696,000,000	710,087,000
Title III commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad		309,200,000	254,959,000	333,609,000
Total	696,000,000	982,580,000	1,007,959,000	1,137,923,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For title I ocean freight differential, the Committee recommends $52,185,000, an increase of $5,805,000 to the budget request and a decrease of $4,815,000 to the House level. The Committee provides $710,087,000 for title II. This amount is $14,087,000 more than the 1991 and House levels and $83,087,000 more than the budget request. For title III, the Committee recommends $333,609,000, an increase of $24,409,000 to the budget request and an increase of $78,650,000 to the House level.

PUBLIC LAW 480 DEBT RESTRUCTURING

Appropriations, 1991	.....
Budget estimate, 1992	$668,000
House allowance	668,000
Committee recommendation	.....

Debt restructuring.—The Enterprise for the Americas Initiative [EAI] is an effort to build closer and more productive relations with Latin America and the Caribbean. The EAI aims to boost trade, investment, and growth throughout the hemisphere. One element of the initiative involves the reduction of bilateral debt to the U.S. Government and the dedication of local currency interest payments to support environmental projects. Countries would become eligible for such debt reduction if they: (1) are pursuing economic reform programs with the IMF and World Bank; (2) are pursuing major investment reforms through an IDB loan or on their own; and, if appropriate, (3) have agreed with their commercial banks on a satisfactory financing program.

As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account records, for this program, the subsidy costs associated with restructuring debt. Budget authority and outlays are calculated as the difference between the net present value of expected payments on existing loans and the net present value of payments after the debt has been reduced.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee makes no recommendation for Public Law 480 debt restructuring. The House provided the budget request of $668,000. The dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991 provided authority for debt restructuring activity under the Public Law 480 program. The Committee was scored $40,000,000 in 1992 budget outlays as a result of providing this authority. The Committee expects a full report on the activities conducted in 1991 prior to providing additional restructuring authority.

CCC EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(EXPORT CREDIT PROGRAMS, GSM–102 AND GSM–103)

	Guarantee loan levels	Guaranteed loan subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 1991	$5,500,000,000		
Budget estimate, 1992	5,700,000,000	[1] $155,524,000	$3,320,000
House allowance	5,700,000,000	155,524,000	3,320,000
Committee recommendation	5,700,000,000	155,524,000	2,465,000

[1] Amount proposed is through a current indefinite appropriation.

In 1980, CCC instituted the Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–102) under its charter authority. With this program, CCC guarantees, for a fee, payments due U.S. exporters under deferred payment sales contracts (up to 36 months) for defaults due to commercial as well as noncommercial risks. The risk to CCC extends from the date of export to the end of the deferred payment period covered in the export sales contract and covers only that portion of the payments agreed to in the assurance agreement. Operation of this program is based on criteria which will assure that it is used only where it is determined that it will develop new market opportunities and maintain and expand existing world markets for U.S. agricultural commodities. The program encourages U.S. financial institutions to provide financing to those areas where the institutions would be unwilling to provide financing in the absence of the CCC guarantees.

In 1986, the Intermediate Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–103) was implemented by CCC under its charter authority as required by the Food Security Act of 1985. The program is similar to the Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–102), but provides for CCC guarantees to exporters for commodities sold on credit terms in excess of 3 years but not more than 10 years. The program also provides for adjusting the maximum amount of interest which CCC guarantees to pay under the payment guarantee and permits freight costs to be covered for breeding animals financed under the GSM–102 and GSM–103 programs.

The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 authorized a program for the promotion of agricultural exports to emerging democracies. Under this program, an additional $1,000,000,000 is required for emerging democracies for the period fiscal years 1991 through 1995.

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 establishes the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the loan guarantees committed in 1992 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000,000 for short-term export credit guarantees, $500,000,000 for intermediate-term export credit guarantees, and $200,000,000 for export credit guarantees to emerging democracies. These amounts are all the same as the House provisions and the budget request.

For the subsidy cost of providing these export credit guarantees, the Committee recommends $155,524,000, the same as the House amount. The budget requested such sums as necessary and estimated the amount of subsidy required to be $155,524,000.

The Committee recommends $2,465,000 for administrative expenses incurred in carrying out the export credit programs. This amount is $855,000 less than the House and budget request levels.

The Committee has amended House bill language to clarify the authority for the program providing export credit guarantees to emerging democracies.

Office of International Cooperation and Development

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $6,879,000
Budget estimate, 1992	6,672,000
House allowance	7,392,000
Committee recommendation	7,247,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $89 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The Office of International Cooperation and Development [OICD] was established by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1947, dated May 1, 1978.

The mission of OICD is to promote U.S. agriculture and to advance the agriculture of developing countries as parts of a complementary global agricultural system capable of providing ample food and fiber for all people. To accomplish this mission, OICD applies USDA policies and U.S. agricultural perspectives in its programs of international agricultural cooperation and development, and in its work with foreign countries, international organizations, U.S. universities and other institutions, agencies of the U.S. Government, and the U.S. private sector.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Office of International Cooperation and Development, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,247,000. This amount is $368,000 more than the 1991 level, $575,000 more than the budget estimate, and $145,000 less than the House level.

The Committee provides $225,000 for an agricultural information exchange program with Ireland as authorized by section 1420 of the Food Security Act of 1985. This amount is the same as the 1991 level.

For the Middle-Income Country Training Program, the recommendation includes $1,850,000, an increase of $114,000 above the

1991 level. These funds will remain available until expended. The Committee expects the program to be expanded to Eastern European nations.

For the Associate Professional Officers Program, the Committee concurs with the House in providing $225,000, the same amount as provided in 1991. The budget proposed to eliminate this funding.

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $1,062,000
Budget estimate, 1992	.....
House allowance	1,062,000
Committee recommendation	.....

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $14 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

As authorized by section 104(c)(7) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), as amended, USDA uses foreign currencies to support agricultural and forestry research on problems of mutual interest to the United States and participating foreign countries. OICD represents all USDA agencies in this activity. Since the program's inception in 1958, over 2,300 projects valued at approximately $179,000,000 equivalent in foreign currency have been negotiated in 33 countries worldwide. The appropriation for scientific activities overseas is allotted as intergovernmental fund transfers when grants are obligated for cooperative research in foreign countries.

Research projects conducted abroad through grants negotiated with foreign research institutions and organizations are selected based on their relevance to priority U.S. agricultural concerns, such as preventing the incursion of animal diseases and exotic insects and developing plants that are drought tolerant, disease-resistant and more productive. Cooperative research benefits U.S. agriculture by developing markets for U.S. agricultural products and equipment, adding to knowledge of our environment, and cutting the cost of valuable research. It also provides access to unique agricultural ecosystems in order to study insects, weeds, and diseases which have entered the United States and have caused severe losses due to lack of biological control.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For scientific activities overseas, the Committee recommends no funds, $1,062,000 less than the amount available in 1991 and recommended by the House. The President's budget requested no funds.

Activities under this account will continue without specific appropriations. The Food, Agriculture, and Trade Act of 1990 provides new authorities in the Public Law 480 statute for agriculture, forestry, and aquaculture research to be funded with foreign currencies which are received as payments under the Public Law 480 title I concessional sales program. Unlike previously, dollar appropriations are no longer required in order to make use of the title I-generated foreign currencies to support this research.

TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Health and Human Services

Food and Drug Administration

The mission of the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] is to ensure that (1) food is safe, pure, and wholesome; (2) cosmetics are safe; (3) human and animal drugs, biological products, and therapeutic devices are safe and effective; and (4) radiological products and use procedures do not result in unnecessary exposure to radiation.

Under the foods program, FDA sets food standards; evaluates food additives and packaging for potential health hazards; conducts research to reduce food-borne disease, to determine specific health impacts of hazardous substances in food and to develop methods for detecting them in foods; maintains surveillance over foods through plant inspections, laboratory analyses, and legal action where necessary; and ensures fair and informative labeling and nutrient information.

The drugs program includes the premarket review of human and animal drugs and biological products in order to ensure their safety and efficacy, research to improve the agency's base of scientific knowledge; and the postmarketing monitoring of drug experience. FDA conducts manufacturer inspections and sample examinations to ensure industry compliance. Included under this program activity is the similar regulation of animal devices, and feeds as well as a program to assure the safety of animal-derived human foods.

The devices and radiological products program conducts premarket review and postmarket surveillance of medical devices to assure their safety and efficacy, and sets standards for the manufacture and use of radiological products to protect the public from unnecessary exposure to radiation. FDA monitors experience with medical devices, and conducts inspections of manufacturing plants and tests of radiological products to ensure compliance with regulations and standards; conducts research to improve the agency's base of scientific knowledge; and conducts education programs to promote safe and effective use of devices and radiological products.

For these three major product-oriented programs, the agency utilizes a wide variety of scientific skills to deal with the many types of products regulated and the many scientific decisions FDA must make. These skills range from field investigators, all of whom must have education in the physical or biological sciences, to chemists, microbiologists, engineers, medical officers, and scientists from many other disciplines. Similarly, FDA utilizes a variety of laboratory facilities, both to test products for safety and to conduct the research necessary to evaluate health hazards and to develop the means to detect product hazards and prevent them.

In addition, the National Center for Toxicological Research in Jefferson, AR, serves as a specialized resource for FDA's other program elements. This facility conducts research to improve the base of scientific knowledge and applied science which the agency uses in conducting its regulatory and consumer protection mission.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $656,519,000
Budget estimate, 1992	537,104,000
House allowance	725,962,000
Committee recommendation	704,734,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $8,535 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For salaries and expenses, the Committee recommends $704,734,000. This amount is $48,215,000 more than the 1991 amount, $167,630,000 more than the budget estimate, and $21,228,000 less than the House level. This amount is the baseline estimated by the Congressional Budget Office to be sufficient to fund current programs at current levels.

Of the amount made available, $51,490,000 will not be available for obligation until September 30, 1992. In addition, $45,421,000 of the appropriation shall be available only to the extent it is requested by the President and designated to be an emergency requirement. The Committee believes that if the current amount requested by the President to be appropriated were the only amount made available, emergencies would indeed develop with regard to the safety of the Nation's blood supply, the safety of the Nation's food supply, and the availability of drugs to meet the Nation's health concerns.

The Committee rejects the administration's proposal to fund the Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses of $197,500,000 through user fees, noting that no authorization has been provided by Congress for user fees, and that the administration's proposal assumes unrealistic collections that would be inadequate to operate the agency. While the Committee concurs with the House by including bill language prohibiting the development or establishment of user fees pursuant to general user fee authority, it does not take a position with regard to specific FDA user fee proposals that may be considered by Congress.

The Committee concurs with the House in holding in reserve an amount subject to an official budget request. The recommendation is to hold $167,630,000, the amount of increase over the budget, in this reserve. The House held $188,858,000 in reserve, the amount that is recommended in addition to the budget request.

The Committee concurs with the House in expecting the Department of Health and Human Services to present credible appropriations requests in the future and not to rely on fictitious, unauthorized, user fees for FDA as a means to offset other departmental needs. The Committee directs that future budget proposals be based on current law.

The Committee concurs with the House in providing not less than $12,000,000 for the Orphan Drug Program.

Of the amount appropriated, the Committee provides $1,000,000 for the FDA to establish minimum standards, qualifications, and procedures to measure adequate laboratory performance prior to implementation of the National Laboratory Accreditation Program [NLAP]. This action is necessary to enhance the capabilities of the APHIS Pesticides Residue Laboratory in Gulfport, MS.

The Committee has included bill language to extend current law for another 5 years with respect to exempting saccharin from a possible FDA ban.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $8,350,000
Budget estimate, 1992	10,000,000
House allowance	10,350,000
Committee recommendation	8,350,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $109 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

In addition to Washington area laboratories which are in nine separate locations, there are 24 lab facilities around the country, including regular field laboratories and specialized facilities, as well as the NCTR complex. Continued repairs, modifications, and improvements to FDA headquarters and field facilities must be made to preserve the properties, ensure employee safety, meet changing program requirements, and permit the agency to keep its laboratory methods up to date.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For continued repairs and improvements of FDA buildings and facilities, the Committee recommends $8,350,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 appropriation, $1,650,000 less than the budget request, and $2,000,000 less than the House level.

The Committee does not concur with the House in providing $2,000,000 to begin specific site selection and planning for a consolidation of FDA activities and has struck bill language allowing for donations of land in Montgomery County and/or Prince Georges County, MD. The Committee notes that funds have been provided for this activity in another appropriations bill.

RENTAL PAYMENTS, FDA

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $25,612,000
Budget estimate, 1992	25,612,000
House allowance	25,612,000
Committee recommendation	25,612,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $333 pursuant to Public Law 99-177.

Annual appropriations are made to agencies of the Federal Government so that they can pay the General Services Administration [GSA] fees for rental of space and for related services.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $25,612,000 for rental payments for the Food and Drug Administration. This amount is the same as the fiscal year 1991 level, the budget estimate, and the House level.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

PAYMENTS TO THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION

Appropriations, 1991	$90,000,000
Budget estimate, 1992	112,606,000
House allowance	112,606,000
Committee recommendation	112,606,000

The Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–233) authorized such sums as necessary to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to the Farm Credit System Assistance Corporation. These payments reimburse the Corporation for interest expenses on U.S. guaranteed debt issued by the Corporation. Assistance Corporation debt proceeds will be used to provide assistance to financially troubled system institutions. Beginning in fiscal 1989, Treasury will annually reimburse 100 percent of the Assistance Corporation interest expense incurred between now and January 1993. Between January 1993 and the ensuing 5 years, Treasury will reimburse 50 percent of the Assistance Corporation's interest expense, with system banks paying the balance. Thereafter all Assistance Corporation interest expense will be paid by system banks.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For interest expenses incurred by the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation as authorized by the Farm Credit Assistance Board, the Committee recommends $112,606,000, $22,606,000 more than the 1991 level and the same as the budget estimate and House level.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1991	[1] $43,960,000
Budget estimate, 1992	48,285,000
House allowance	47,300,000
Committee recommendation	46,597,000

[1] Does not reflect sequester of $571 pursuant to Public Law 99–177.

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission [CFTC] was established as an independent agency by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 1389; 7 U.S.C. 4a).

The Commission administers the Commodity Exchange Act, 7 U.S.C. section 1, et seq. The 1974 act brought under Federal regulation futures trading in all goods, articles, services, rights, and interests; commodity options trading; and leverage trading in gold and silver bullion and coins; and otherwise strengthened the regulation of the commodity futures trading industry. It established a comprehensive regulatory structure to oversee the volatile futures trading complex.

The purpose of the Commission is to protect and further the economic utility of futures markets by encouraging their efficiency, assuring their integrity, and protecting participants against manipulation, abusive trade practices, fraud, and deceit. The objective is to

enable the markets better to serve their designated functions of providing a price discovery mechanism and providing price risk insurance. In properly serving these functions, the futures markets contribute toward better production and financial planning, more efficient distribution and consumption, and more economical marketing.

Programs in support of the overall mission include market surveillance analysis and research; registration, audits, and contract markets; enforcement; reparations; proceedings; legal counsel; agency direction; and administrative support services. CFTC activities are carried out in Washington, DC, four regional offices located in Chicago, New York, Kansas City, and Los Angeles; and a branch office located in Minneapolis.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Committee recommends $46,597,000, $2,637,000 more than the amount provided in 1991, $1,688,000 less than the budget request, and $703,000 less than the House amount.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON REVOLVING FUND FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitations, 1991	$40,898,000
Budget estimate, 1992	43,276,000
House allowance	40,290,000
Committee recommendation	40,290,000

The Farm Credit Administration [FCA] is the independent agency in the executive branch of the Government responsible for the examination and regulation of the banks, associations, and other institutions of the Farm Credit System.

Activities of the Farm Credit Administration include the planning and execution of examinations of Farm Credit System institutions and the preparation of examination reports. FCA also establishes standards, enforces rules and regulations, and approves certain actions of the institutions.

The administration and the institutions under its jurisdiction now operate under authorities contained in the Farm Credit Act of 1971, Public Law 92-181, effective December 10, 1971. Public Law 99-205, effective December 23, 1985, restructured FCA and gave the agency regulatory authorities and enforcement powers.

The act provides for the farmer-owned cooperative system to make sound, adequate, and constructive credit available to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives, rural residences, and associations and other entities upon which farming operations are dependent, and to modernize existing farm credit law to meet current and future rural credit needs.

The Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 authorizes the formation of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation [FAMC] to operate a secondary market for agricultural and rural housing mortgages. The Farm Credit Administration, under section 8.11 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, is assigned the responsibility of

regulating this new entity and assuring its safe and sound operation.

Expenses of the Farm Credit Administration are paid by assessments collected from the banks of the Farm Credit System, and by assessments to the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For the limitation on administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration, the Committee recommends $40,290,000. This amount is $608,000 less than the limitation in 1991, $2,986,000 less than the budget estimate, and the same as the House level.

The Committee will expect FCA to continue to assess the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation [Farmer Mac] for costs associated with its regulation and to identify these costs, including overhead, separately, and with specificity, in its budgets.

The Committee notes that the Farm Credit Administration was substantially reorganized by the Farm Credit Amendments Act of 1985. Since that time, no independent, comprehensive review has been undertaken of the most cost-effective operational structure for both its national and field staff, as well as for its management, examination, and other functional areas. The Committee is concerned that the agency's cost of operation has continued to increase at the same time that the number of institutions it regulates and examines has declined. Therefore, the Committee directs the Farm Credit Administration to contract with an independent, outside firm to conduct a full operational audit of FCA. The results of this audit shall be reported to the FCA Board and shall include recommendations regarding the present operational and management structure of the agency, including the efficient use and allocation of staff resources. The Committee expects to receive a report on the results of this study prior to its consideration of the fiscal year 1993 budget for the FCA.

Farm Credit System Assistance Board

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 1991	$2,017,000
Budget estimate, 1992	2,175,000
House allowance	2,175,000
Committee recommendation	2,175,000

The Assistance Board was created by the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-233) and was federally chartered in January 1988. Its members consist of the Secretaries of Treasury and Agriculture, and one other member appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The purposes of the Assistance Board are to authorize financial assistance to system banks, protect the stock of borrowers, and permit system banks to offer credit at competitive terms. If authorized, a system bank would issue preferred stock which would be purchased by the Farm Credit System Assistance Corporation, a new FCS institution also created by the 1987 Farm Credit Act.

The Assistance Board is also empowered to prescribe business operating plans and issue regulations to banks for whom assistance is

authorized. Its authority will end December 31, 1992. Administrative costs of the Board will be paid by the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

For a limitation on administrative expenses for the Farm Credit System Assistance Board, the Committee recommends $2,175,000. This amount is the same as the 1991 limitation, the budget request, and the House recommendation.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sections 701–736 of the general provisions contained in the accompanying bill are essentially the same as those included in previous appropriations bills and in the House bill. The Committee recommends changes to several of these general provisions to make them permanent law so they will not have to be repeated in annual appropriations bills.

However, the Committee has struck House section 735 that prohibits the establishment of any new office, organization, or center for which funds have not been provided in advance in appropriations acts. The Committee is concerned that the Department used this prohibition in order not to implement some programs but perhaps did not comply with it on others.

A new section 735 has been added by the Committee providing that $70,000,000 of funds for the Market Promotion Program shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992.

The Committee concurs with the House in adding section 737 that allows the Department to reimburse employees for the cost of State license and certification fees pursuant to their official position in order to comply with State laws, regulations, and requirements. This provision was proposed in the budget.

Section 738 has been recommended in the budget and by the House and allows the Department to pay incidental expenses, such as transportation, uniforms, lodging, and subsistence, for volunteers engaged in work related to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Volunteer Programs. The Committee concurs with this section.

The Committee concurs with the House in adding section 739 providing that in situations in which a county committee, acting pursuant to section 335 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, had made its initial selection of a buyer of an inventory farm before November 28, 1990, such sales shall be completed as soon as the selection decision is administratively final and all terms and conditions have been agreed to. The Committee has struck House language providing that priority shall be given to the former owner and members of the immediate family in carrying out sales of inventory property.

Section 740 provides that none of the funds appropriated shall be used to exclude coverage under section 2244 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 of any crop of valencia oranges that, regardless of harvest year, was destroyed or damaged by freeze or related condition in 1990 and is covered by that section.

A new section 741 is recommended providing that, in carrying out loan programs provided for in this act, the Department shall use subsidy rates not higher than those estimated by the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] and published in the Budget of the

U.S. Government for fiscal year 1992. The Committee notes that, in many cases, the subsidy rates published by OMB are lower than those estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. These differences make a significant difference in estimating the amount of subsidy required for the various loan programs. The Committee has used the OMB rates in recommending funding for these loan programs. Should these rates prove to be erroneous, as experience with loan programs under credit reform develops, the Committee will expect adjustments to be made to these subsidy rates in future budgets.

Section 742 is recommended by the Committee to extend authorizations for the section 515 Rural Rental Loan Program and the section 523 Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grant and Loan Program through fiscal year 1992.

In addition, the Committee recommends bill language changing the authorization for the section 502 rural housing program to make the guaranteed loan program conform with the direct loan program.

Program, Project, and Activity

During fiscal year 1992, for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177) or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–119), the following information provides the definition of the term "program, project, and activity" for departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies bill. The term "program, project, and activity" shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992, the House and Senate Committee reports, and the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference.

If a sequestration order is necessary, in implementing the Presidential order, departments and agencies shall apply any percentage reduction required for fiscal year 1992 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–177 or Public Law 100–119 to all items specified in the explanatory notes submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate in support of the fiscal year 1992 budget estimates, as amended, for such departments and agencies, as modified by congressional action, and in addition:

For the Agricultural Research Service the definition shall include specific research locations as identified in the explanatory notes and lines of research specifically identified in the reports of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

For the Soil Conservation Service the definition shall include individual flood prevention projects as identified in the explanatory notes and individual operational watershed projects as summarized in the notes.

For the Farmers Home Administration the definition shall include individual State, district, and county offices.

For the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service the definition shall include individual State and county offices.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports accompanying general appropriations bills identify each recommended amendment which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.

The Committee recommends the following amendments in compliance with this rule providing amounts for programs whose authorization expires as of September 30, 1991.

The Committee recommends up to $5,000,000 for the farmer's market coupon demonstration project. The Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended, section 17(m), 42 U.S.C. 1786(m), requires the Secretary to conduct a WIC Farmers' Market (102 Stat. 1668). This authority expires September 30, 1991.

The Committee recommends $143,035,000 for the elderly feeding program. Section 311(a)(4) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3030a(a)(4), authorizes appropriations for the Nutrition Program for the Elderly, Public Law 100-175 (101 Stat. 933). This authority expires September 30, 1991.

The Committee recommends $573,900,000 for rental housing loans. Section 515(b)(4), 42 U.S.C. 1485, authorization for rental housing loans (103 Stat. 825), expires September 30, 1991. Also, the Committee recommends $8,750,000 for mutual and self-help housing grants. Section 523, 42 U.S.C. 1490c, mutual and self-help housing grant and loan authority (103 Stat. 826) expires September 30, 1991. The Committee notes that the authorization for these two housing programs is recommended in this bill by section 741.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

Currently, section 502(h)(3)(C) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472 note) reads: "located in a rural area that is more than 25 miles from an urban area." The Committee recommends changing the provision to read: "located in a rural area."

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS							
Production, Processing and Marketing							
Office of the Secretary	1,943,000	2,282,000	2,282,000	2,150,000	+207,000	-132,000	-132,000
Office of the Deputy Secretary	477,000	543,000	543,000	514,000	+37,000	-29,000	-29,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	4,971,000	5,549,000	6,149,000	5,303,000	+332,000	-246,000	-846,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	544,000	658,000	596,000	576,000	+32,000	-82,000	-20,000
Rental payments (USDA)	49,305,000	51,598,000	50,808,000	51,598,000	+2,293,000	---	+790,000
Building operations and maintenance	25,093,000	25,700,000	25,700,000	25,349,000	+256,000	-351,000	-351,000
Advisory committees (USDA)	1,407,000	2,038,000	1,918,000	2,038,000	+631,000	---	+120,000
Hazardous waste management	24,757,000	29,943,000	27,943,000	24,757,000	---	-5,186,000	-3,186,000
Departmental administration	23,052,000	26,563,000	25,064,000	24,814,000	+1,762,000	-1,749,000	-250,000
Working Capital Fund	3,750,000	---	---	---	-3,750,000	---	---
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	1,095,000	1,310,000	1,307,000	1,265,000	+170,000	-45,000	-42,000
Office of Public Affairs	8,442,000	9,093,000	8,925,000	8,925,000	+483,000	-168,000	---
Intergovernmental affairs	440,000	506,000	468,000	468,000	+28,000	-38,000	---
Total, Office of Public Affairs	8,882,000	9,599,000	9,393,000	9,393,000	+511,000	-206,000	---
Office of the Inspector General	55,580,000	65,247,000	62,786,000	60,786,000	+5,206,000	-4,461,000	-2,000,000
Office of the General Counsel	23,130,000	25,865,000	24,554,000	24,554,000	+1,424,000	-1,311,000	---
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics	529,000	580,000	580,000	563,000	+34,000	-17,000	-17,000
Economic Research Service	54,400,000	62,479,000	59,125,000	56,245,000	+1,845,000	-6,234,000	-2,880,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service	76,451,000	86,866,000	83,401,000	75,447,000	-1,004,000	-11,419,000	-7,954,000
World Agricultural Outlook Board	2,196,000	2,520,000	2,367,000	2,341,000	+145,000	-179,000	-26,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education	512,000	560,000	560,000	544,000	+32,000	-16,000	-16,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization	---	---	---	5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
Agricultural Research Service	621,585,000	660,627,000	658,424,000	629,143,000	+7,558,000	-31,484,000	-29,281,000
Special fund	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	---	---	---

Buildings and facilities	41,016,000	46,100,000	49,473,000	61,818,000	+20,802,000	+15,718,000	+12,345,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	665,101,000	709,227,000	710,397,000	693,461,000	+28,360,000	-15,766,000	-16,936,000
Cooperative State Research Service	388,489,000	384,151,000	412,886,000	419,788,000	+31,299,000	+35,637,000	+6,902,000
(By transfer)	(93,000)	---	---	---	(-93,000)	---	---
Buildings and facilities	62,867,000	25,000,000	62,529,000	60,769,000	-2,098,000	+35,769,000	-1,760,000
Extension Service	398,478,000	410,817,000	417,057,000	412,129,000	+13,651,000	+1,312,000	-4,928,000
National Agricultural Library	16,798,000	17,453,000	17,253,000	17,149,000	+351,000	-304,000	-104,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services	497,000	550,000	550,000	535,000	+38,000	-15,000	-15,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:							
Salaries and expenses	381,120,000	324,378,000	340,981,000	337,631,000	-43,489,000	+13,253,000	-3,350,000
Special fund, user fees	13,000,000	85,922,000	85,922,000	78,356,000	+65,336,000	-7,566,000	-7,566,000
Buildings and facilities	21,396,000	23,400,000	21,396,000	20,900,000	-496,000	-2,500,000	-496,000
Total, Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service	415,516,000	433,700,000	448,299,000	436,887,000	+21,371,000	+3,187,000	-11,412,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service	448,882,000	473,512,000	473,512,000	473,512,000	+24,630,000	---	---
Federal Grain Inspection Service	9,706,000	13,011,000	11,397,000	10,557,000	+851,000	-2,454,000	-840,000
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on adminstrative expenses, from fees collected)	(37,164,000)	(40,176,000)	(39,383,000)	(40,176,000)	(+3,012,000)	---	(+793,000)
Agricultural Cooperative Service	4,864,000	5,140,000	5,640,000	5,140,000	+276,000	---	-500,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:							
Marketing Services	47,914,000	68,333,000	56,636,000	42,066,000	-5,848,000	-26,267,000	-14,570,000
(Limitation on adminstrative expenses, from fees collected)	(40,162,000)	(50,735,000)	(50,735,000)	(50,735,000)	(+10,573,000)	---	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	8,255,000	10,360,000	10,360,000	10,360,000	+2,105,000	---	---
Payments to States and possessions	1,250,000	980,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	---	+270,000	---
Miscellaneous trust funds	---	2,625,000	1,650,000	600,000	+600,000	-2,025,000	-1,050,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	57,419,000	82,298,000	69,896,000	54,276,000	-3,143,000	-28,022,000	-15,620,000
Office of Transportation	2,429,000	---	---	---	-2,429,000	---	---
Packers and Stockyards Administration	10,687,000	11,359,000	12,009,000	11,859,000	+1,172,000	+500,000	-150,000
Total, Production, Processing and Marketing	2,839,807,000	2,966,118,000	3,026,501,000	2,969,299,000	+129,492,000	+3,181,000	-57,202,000
Farm Income Stabilization							
Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs	506,000	740,000	551,000	531,000	+25,000	-209,000	-20,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:							
(By transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(630,406,000)	(769,736,000)	---	(719,289,000)	(+88,883,000)	(-50,447,000)	(+719,289,000)
Salaries and expenses	46,900,000	---	719,289,000	---	-46,900,000	---	-719,289,000
Export loans	---	(589,000)	(589,000)	(589,000)	(+589,000)	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
P.L. 480	---	(573,000)	(573,000)	(558,000)	(+558,000)	(-15,000)	(-15,000)
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	(677,306,000)	(770,898,000)	(720,451,000)	(720,436,000)	(+43,130,000)	(-50,462,000)	(-15,000)
Dairy indemnity program	5,000	---	5,000	5,000	---	+5,000	---
Total, Farm Income Stabilization	(677,817,000)	(771,638,000)	(721,007,000)	(720,972,000)	(+43,155,000)	(-50,666,000)	(-35,000)
CORPORATIONS							
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:							
Administrative and operating expenses	325,857,000	322,870,000	322,870,000	322,870,000	-2,987,000	---	---
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	337,365,000	308,782,000	221,500,000	260,500,000	-76,865,000	-48,282,000	+39,000,000
Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	663,222,000	631,652,000	544,370,000	583,370,000	-79,852,000	-48,282,000	+39,000,000
Commodity Credit Corporation:							
Reimbursement for net realized losses	5,000,000,000	9,000,000,000	8,450,000,000	8,450,000,000	+3,450,000,000	-550,000,000	---
Disaster payments	1,400,000	---	---	---	-1,400,000	---	---
Hazardous waste (limitation on administrative expenses)	---	(3,000,000)	(5,000,000)	---	---	(-3,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
Options pilot program (limitation on administrative expenses)	---	(1,000,000)	---	---	---	(-1,000,000)	---
General Sales Manager (transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(7,803,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(-2,705,000)	---	---
Export loans	---	(2,731,000)	(2,731,000)	(2,731,000)	(+2,731,000)	---	---
P.L. 480	---	(1,274,000)	(1,274,000)	(1,242,000)	(+1,242,000)	(-32,000)	(-32,000)
Subtotal, General Sales Manager	(7,803,000)	(9,103,000)	(9,103,000)	(9,071,000)	(+1,268,000)	(-32,000)	(-32,000)
Total, Corporations:							
New budget (obligational) authority	5,664,622,000	9,631,652,000	8,994,370,000	9,033,370,000	+3,368,748,000	-598,282,000	+39,000,000
(By transfer)	(7,803,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(-2,705,000)	---	---
(Loan authorization)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Total, title I, Agricultural Programs:							
New budget (obligational) authority	8,551,840,000	12,598,510,000	12,740,716,000	12,003,205,000	+3,451,365,000	-595,305,000	-737,511,000
(By transfer)	(638,302,000)	(774,834,000)	(5,098,000)	(724,387,000)	(+86,085,000)	(-50,447,000)	(+719,289,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(77,326,000)	(94,911,000)	(95,118,000)	(90,911,000)	(+13,585,000)	(-4,000,000)	(-4,207,000)
(Loan authorization)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS							
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	520,000	563,000	563,000	543,000	+23,000	-20,000	-20,000
Soil Conservation Service:							
Conservation operations	509,056,000	588,604,000	564,129,000	564,129,000	+55,073,000	-24,475,000	---
River basin surveys and investigations	12,783,000	10,982,000	13,251,000	13,251,000	+468,000	+2,269,000	---
Watershed planning	9,176,000	7,291,000	9,545,000	9,545,000	+369,000	+2,254,000	---
Watershed and flood prevention operations	185,705,000	152,961,000	205,238,000	205,266,000	+19,561,000	+52,305,000	+28,000
Resource conservation and development	29,900,000	23,631,000	32,516,000	31,236,000	+1,336,000	+7,605,000	-1,280,000
Great Plains conservation program	24,637,000	25,271,000	25,271,000	25,271,000	+634,000	---	---
Total, Soil Conservation Service	771,257,000	808,740,000	849,950,000	848,698,000	+77,441,000	+39,958,000	-1,252,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:							
Agricultural conservation program	190,152,000	178,024,000	194,435,000	193,652,000	+3,500,000	+15,628,000	-783,000
Water quality incentives program	---	5,000,000	3,500,000	---	---	-5,000,000	-3,500,000
Forestry incentives program	12,446,000	12,446,000	12,446,000	12,446,000	---	---	---
Water bank program	13,620,000	10,935,000	18,620,000	18,620,000	+5,000,000	+7,685,000	---
Emergency conservation program	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---	-10,000,000	---	-10,000,000
Colorado River Basin salinity control program	14,783,000	14,783,000	14,783,000	14,783,000	---	---	---
Conservation reserve program	1,314,926,000	1,642,760,000	1,642,760,000	1,611,277,000	+296,351,000	-31,483,000	-31,483,000
Wetlands reserve program	---	124,350,000	---	91,000,000	+91,000,000	-33,350,000	+91,000,000
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	1,555,927,000	1,988,298,000	1,896,544,000	1,941,778,000	+385,851,000	-46,520,000	+45,234,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs, new budget (obligational) authority	2,327,704,000	2,797,601,000	2,747,057,000	2,791,019,000	+463,315,000	-6,582,000	+43,962,000
TITLE III - FARMERS HOME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS							
Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development	530,000	721,000	572,000	552,000	+22,000	-169,000	-20,000
Farmers Home Administration:							
Rural Housing Insurance Fund:							
Loan authorizations:							
Low-income housing (sec. 502):							
Subsidized direct	(1,226,451,000)	(559,000,000)	(1,226,451,000)	(1,256,451,000)	(+30,000,000)	(+697,451,000)	(+30,000,000)
Unsubsidized direct	(50,000,000)	---	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	---	(+50,000,000)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(70,000,000)	(347,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+30,000,000)	(-247,000,000)	(-250,000,000)
Subsidized guaranteed	(30,000,000)	(347,000,000)	---	---	(-30,000,000)	(-347,000,000)	---
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(11,330,000)	(11,100,000)	(11,330,000)	(11,330,000)	---	(+230,000)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(16,300,000)	(16,250,000)	(16,300,000)	(16,300,000)	---	(+50,000)	---
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(573,900,000)	(341,000,000)	(573,900,000)	(573,900,000)	---	(+232,900,000)	---
Site loans	(600,000)	---	(600,000)	(600,000)	---	(+600,000)	---
Credit sales of acquired property	(288,000,000)	(284,000,000)	(284,000,000)	---	(-288,000,000)	(-284,000,000)	(-284,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,266,581,000)	(1,905,350,000)	(2,512,581,000)	(2,008,581,000)	(-258,000,000)	(+103,231,000)	(-504,000,000)
Loan subsidies:							
Single family (sec. 502):							
Direct	---	126,578,000	312,536,000	286,461,000	+286,461,000	+159,883,000	-26,075,000
Guaranteed	---	96,680,000	12,360,000	1,130,000	+1,130,000	-95,550,000	-11,230,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)	---	4,897,000	5,280,000	4,999,000	+4,999,000	+102,000	-281,000
Farm labor (sec. 514)	---	8,975,000	9,536,000	9,002,000	+9,002,000	+27,000	-534,000
Rental housing (sec. 515)	---	147,657,000	268,585,000	248,499,000	+248,499,000	+100,842,000	-20,086,000
Site loans	---	---	---	9,000	+9,000	+9,000	+9,000
Credit sales of acquired property	---	41,724,000	40,612,000	---	---	-41,724,000	-40,612,000
Total, Loan subsidies	---	426,511,000	648,909,000	550,100,000	+550,100,000	+123,589,000	-98,809,000
RHIF Salaries and expenses	---	425,173,000	425,173,000	428,746,000	+428,746,000	+3,573,000	+3,573,000
Collection and servicing contracts (limitation on obligations)	(10,000,000)	---	---	---	(-10,000,000)	---	---
Rent supplement	319,900,000	269,800,000	308,100,000	319,900,000	---	+50,100,000	+11,800,000
Reimbursement for interest and other losses	2,667,186,000	---	---	---	-2,667,186,000	---	---
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund:							
New budget (obligational) authority	2,987,086,000	1,121,484,000	1,382,182,000	1,298,746,000	-1,688,340,000	+177,262,000	-83,436,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,266,581,000)	(1,905,350,000)	(2,512,581,000)	(2,008,581,000)	(-258,000,000)	(+103,231,000)	(-504,000,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,000,000)	---	---	---	(-10,000,000)	---	---
Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund:							
Loan authorization	(500,000)	---	(500,000)	(500,000)	---	(+500,000)	---
Loan subsidy	---	---	---	43,000	+43,000	+43,000	+43,000
Administrative expenses	---	---	---	21,000	+21,000	+21,000	+21,000

Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund:							
Loan authorizations:							
Farm ownership loans:							
Direct	(46,500,000)	(37,000,000)	(46,500,000)	(87,000,000)	(+40,500,000)	(+50,000,000)	(+40,500,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(509,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(509,000,000)	(774,000,000)	(+265,000,000)	(+624,000,000)	(+265,000,000)
Guaranteed subsidized	---	(50,000,000)	---	---	---	(-50,000,000)	---
Subtotal	(555,500,000)	(237,000,000)	(555,500,000)	(861,000,000)	(+305,500,000)	(+624,000,000)	(+305,500,000)
Operating loans:							
Direct	(900,000,000)	(410,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(840,000,000)	(-60,000,000)	(+430,000,000)	(-60,000,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(2,600,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,600,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(-1,600,000,000)	(-1,000,000,000)	(-1,600,000,000)
Guaranteed subsidized	---	(564,000,000)	---	---	---	(-564,000,000)	---
Subtotal	(3,500,000,000)	(2,974,000,000)	(3,500,000,000)	(1,840,000,000)	(-1,660,000,000)	(-1,134,000,000)	(-1,660,000,000)
Soil and water loans:							
Direct	(5,500,000)	---	(5,500,000)	(5,500,000)	---	(+5,500,000)	---
Guaranteed	(1,500,000)	---	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	(+1,500,000)	---
Subtotal	(7,000,000)	---	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	---	(+7,000,000)	---
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	---	(-1,000,000)	---
Emergency disaster loans	(600,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	---	(+575,000,000)	---
Watershed and flood prevention	(4,000,000)	---	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	---	(+4,000,000)	---
Resource conservation loans	(600,000)	---	(600,000)	(600,000)	---	(+600,000)	---
Credit sales of acquired property	(200,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)	---	(-200,000,000)	(-250,000,000)	(-250,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(4,868,100,000)	(3,488,000,000)	(4,918,100,000)	(3,313,600,000)	(-1,554,500,000)	(-174,400,000)	(-1,604,500,000)
Loan subsidies:							
Farm ownership:							
Direct	---	9,144,000	18,089,000	19,865,000	+19,865,000	+10,721,000	+1,776,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized	---	7,526,000	15,270,000	38,870,000	+38,870,000	+31,344,000	+23,600,000
Guaranteed subsidized	---	18,308,000	---	---	---	-18,308,000	---
Farm operating:							
Direct	---	66,952,000	189,000,000	128,937,000	+128,937,000	+61,985,000	-60,063,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized	---	24,981,000	31,200,000	12,475,000	+12,475,000	-12,506,000	-18,725,000
Guaranteed subsidized	---	47,528,000	---	---	---	-47,528,000	---
Soil and water loans:							
Direct	---	---	2,585,000	456,000	+456,000	+456,000	-2,129,000
Guaranteed	---	---	30,000	43,000	+43,000	+43,000	+13,000
Indian tribe land acquisition	---	505,000	1,000,000	253,000	+253,000	-252,000	-747,000
Emergency disaster	---	5,065,000	32,100,000	121,560,000	+121,560,000	+116,495,000	+89,460,000
Watershed and flood prevention loans	---	---	1,880,000	1,000	+1,000	+1,000	-1,879,000
Resource conservation	---	---	282,000	1,000	+1,000	+1,000	-281,000
Credit sales of acquired property	---	74,851,000	117,500,000	---	---	-74,851,000	-117,500,000
Total, Loan subsidies	---	254,860,000	408,936,000	322,461,000	+322,461,000	+67,601,000	-86,475,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
ACIF salaries and expenses	---	230,179,000	230,179,000	229,557,000	+229,557,000	-622,000	-622,000
State mediation program	3,750,000	2,000,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	---	+1,750,000	---
Reimbursement for interest and other losses	6,014,356,000	---	---	---	-6,014,356,000	---	---
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund:							
New budget (obligational) authority	6,018,106,000	487,039,000	642,865,000	555,768,000	-5,462,338,000	+68,729,000	-87,097,000
(Loan authorization)	(4,868,100,000)	(3,488,000,000)	(4,918,100,000)	(3,313,600,000)	(-1,554,500,000)	(-174,400,000)	(-1,604,500,000)
Rural Development Insurance Fund:							
Loan authorizations:							
Water and sewer facility loans:							
Direct	(500,000,000)	(425,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	(+75,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
Guaranteed	(35,000,000)	---	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	---	(+35,000,000)	---
Subtotal	(535,000,000)	(425,000,000)	(635,000,000)	(535,000,000)	---	(+110,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
Community facility loans:							
Direct	(100,000,000)	(45,700,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	---	(+54,300,000)	---
Guaranteed	(25,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	---	(-25,000,000)	---
Subtotal	(125,000,000)	(95,700,000)	(125,000,000)	(125,000,000)	---	(+29,300,000)	---
Industrial development loans:							
Guaranteed	(100,000,000)	(95,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	---	(+5,000,000)	---
Total, loan authorizations	(760,000,000)	(615,700,000)	(860,000,000)	(760,000,000)	---	(+144,300,000)	(-100,000,000)
Loan subsidies:							
Water and sewer:							
Direct	---	63,678,000	96,000,000	74,900,000	+74,900,000	+11,222,000	-21,100,000
Guaranteed	---	---	840,000	630,000	+630,000	+630,000	-210,000
Community facility:							
Direct	---	5,490,000	14,000,000	12,011,000	+12,011,000	+6,521,000	-1,989,000
Guaranteed	---	1,016,000	325,000	508,000	+508,000	-508,000	+183,000
Industrial development	---	5,573,000	7,920,000	5,870,000	+5,870,000	+297,000	-2,050,000
Total, Loan subsidies	---	75,757,000	119,085,000	93,919,000	+93,919,000	+18,162,000	-25,166,000

RDIF salaries and expenses	---	54,906,000	54,906,000	52,286,000	+52,286,000	-2,620,000	-2,620,000
Reimbursement for interest and other losses	1,666,160,000	---	---	---	-1,666,160,000	---	---
Tptal, Rural Development Insurance Fund:							
New budget (obligational) authority	1,666,160,000	130,663,000	173,991,000	146,205,000	-1,519,955,000	+15,542,000	-27,786,000
(Loan authorization)	(760,000,000)	(615,700,000)	(860,000,000)	(760,000,000)	---	(+144,300,000)	(-100,000,000)
Rural Development Loan Fund:							
(Loan authorization)	(32,500,000)	(35,000,000)	(32,500,000)	(32,500,000)	---	(-2,500,000)	---
Appropriation	30,500,000	---	---	---	-30,500,000	---	---
Loan subsidy	---	17,510,000	22,050,000	16,260,000	+16,260,000	-1,250,000	-5,790,000
RDLF Salaries and expenses	---	689,000	689,000	656,000	+656,000	-33,000	-33,000
Rural water and waste disposal grants	300,000,000	225,000,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	+50,000,000	+125,000,000	---
Very low-income housing repair grants	12,500,000	5,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	---	+7,500,000	---
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	11,000,000	5,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	---	+6,000,000	---
Mutual and self-help housing	8,750,000	---	8,750,000	8,750,000	---	+8,750,000	---
Supervisory and technical assistance grants	---	---	2,500,000	---	---	---	-2,500,000
Rural community fire protection grants	3,500,000	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	---	+3,500,000	---
Compensation for construction defects	500,000	---	500,000	500,000	---	+500,000	---
Rural rental assistance payments (voucher program)	---	189,928,000	---	---	---	-189,928,000	---
Rural housing preservation grants	23,000,000	10,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	---	+13,000,000	---
Rural development grants	20,750,000	20,000,000	20,750,000	20,750,000	---	+750,000	---
Solid waste management grants	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	3,000,000	+1,500,000	+3,000,000	+1,500,000
Emergency community water assistance grants	10,000,000	---	---	10,000,000	---	+10,000,000	+10,000,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	391,500,000	454,928,000	434,000,000	443,000,000	+51,500,000	-11,928,000	+9,000,000
Office of the Administrator	600,000	---	600,000	600,000	---	+600,000	---
Salaries and expenses	439,854,000	26,548,000	37,637,000	38,959,000	-400,895,000	+12,411,000	+1,322,000
Transfer from loan accounts	4,000,000	---	---	---	-4,000,000	---	---
Transfer from revolving fund	271,673,000	---	---	---	-271,673,000	---	---
Loan administrative expenses:							
RHIF	---	(425,173,000)	(425,173,000)	(428,746,000)	(+428,746,000)	(+3,573,000)	(+3,573,000)
ACIF	---	(230,179,000)	(230,179,000)	(229,557,000)	(+229,557,000)	(-622,000)	(-622,000)
RDIF	---	(54,906,000)	(54,906,000)	(52,286,000)	(+52,286,000)	(-2,620,000)	(-2,620,000)
RDLF	---	(689,000)	(689,000)	(656,000)	(+656,000)	(-33,000)	(-33,000)
Self-Help HLDF	---	---	---	(21,000)	(+21,000)	(+21,000)	(+21,000)
Total, salaries and expenses	(715,527,000)	(737,495,000)	(748,584,000)	(750,225,000)	(+34,698,000)	(+12,730,000)	(+1,641,000)
Total, Farmers Home Administration:							
New budget (obligational) authority	11,809,479,000	2,238,861,000	2,694,014,000	2,500,258,000	-9,309,221,000	+261,397,000	-193,756,000
(Loan authorization)	(7,927,681,000)	(6,044,050,000)	(8,323,681,000)	(6,115,181,000)	(-1,812,500,000)	(+71,131,000)	(-2,208,500,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,000,000)	---	---	---	(-10,000,000)	---	---
Rural Development Administration:							
Salaries and expenses	---	13,722,000	---	---	---	-13,722,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Rural Electrification Administration:							
Rural electrification and telephone loans program account:							
Loan authorizations:							
Direct loans:							
Electric	(622,050,000)	(504,958,000)	(622,050,000)	(622,050,000)	---	(+117,092,000)	---
Telephone	(239,250,000)	(194,042,000)	(239,250,000)	(239,250,000)	---	(+45,208,000)	---
Subtotal	(861,300,000)	(699,000,000)	(861,300,000)	(861,300,000)	---	(+162,300,000)	---
FFB loans:							
Electric	(813,450,000)	---	(813,450,000)	(813,450,000)	---	(+813,450,000)	---
Telephone	(119,625,000)	---	(119,625,000)	(119,625,000)	---	(+119,625,000)	---
Subtotal	(933,075,000)	---	(933,075,000)	(933,075,000)	---	(+933,075,000)	---
Guaranteed loans:							
Electric	---	(169,042,000)	(169,042,000)	---	---	(-169,042,000)	(-169,042,000)
Telephone	---	(64,958,000)	(64,958,000)	---	---	(-64,958,000)	(-64,958,000)
Subtotal	---	(234,000,000)	(234,000,000)	---	---	(-234,000,000)	(-234,000,000)
Modified direct loans	---	(493,700,000)	(493,700,000)	(493,700,000)	(+493,700,000)	---	---
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,794,375,000)	(1,426,700,000)	(2,522,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(+493,700,000)	(+861,375,000)	(-234,000,000)
Loan subsidies:							
Direct loans:							
Electric	---	95,237,000	166,087,000	117,319,000	+117,319,000	+22,082,000	-48,768,000
Telephone	---	32,629,000	63,880,000	40,290,000	+40,290,000	+7,661,000	-23,590,000
Guaranteed loans:							
Electric	---	62,000	62,000	---	---	-62,000	-62,000
Telephone	---	43,000	43,000	---	---	-43,000	-43,000
FFB Loans	---	---	6,531,000	14,152,000	+14,152,000	+14,152,000	+7,621,000
Total, Loan subsidies	---	127,971,000	236,603,000	171,761,000	+171,761,000	+43,790,000	-64,842,000

RETRF salaries and expenses	---	29,419,000	29,163,000	28,311,000	+28,311,000	-1,108,000	-852,000
Reimbursement to the rural electrification and telephone loans program account	266,603,000	---	---	---	-266,603,000	---	---
Total, Rural electrification and telephone loans program account:							
New budget (obligational) authority	266,603,000	157,390,000	265,766,000	200,072,000	-66,531,000	+42,682,000	-65,694,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,794,375,000)	(1,426,700,000)	(2,522,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(+493,700,000)	(+861,375,000)	(-234,000,000)
Rural telephone bank program account	28,710,000	---	---	---	-28,710,000	---	---
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	(177,045,000)	(125,000,000)	(177,045,000)	(177,045,000)	---	(+52,045,000)	---
Direct loan subsidy	---	2,563,000	11,331,000	3,629,000	+3,629,000	+1,066,000	-7,702,000
RTB salaries and expenses	---	8,632,000	8,632,000	8,392,000	+8,392,000	-240,000	-240,000
Rural communication development fund	1,264,000	1,264,000	1,264,000	---	-1,264,000	-1,264,000	-1,264,000
Distance Learning and Medical Link Programs	---	---	5,000,000	---	---	---	-5,000,000
Rural economic development subaccount:							
Direct loan appropriation	5,000,000	---	---	---	-5,000,000	---	---
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	---	(4,800,000)	(5,000,000)	(8,406,000)	(+8,406,000)	(+3,606,000)	(+3,406,000)
Direct subsidy	---	1,454,000	1,700,000	2,546,000	+2,546,000	+1,092,000	+846,000
Office of the Administrator	229,000	---	256,000	243,000	+14,000	+243,000	-13,000
Salaries and expenses	32,826,000	---	---	---	-32,826,000	---	---
Electric and telephone loans	---	(29,419,000)	(29,163,000)	(28,311,000)	(+28,311,000)	(-1,108,000)	(-852,000)
Rural telephone bank program account	---	(8,632,000)	(8,632,000)	(8,392,000)	(+8,392,000)	(-240,000)	(-240,000)
Subtotal	(32,826,000)	(38,051,000)	(37,795,000)	(36,703,000)	(+3,877,000)	(-1,348,000)	(-1,092,000)
Total, Rural Electrification Administration:							
New budget (obligational) authority	334,632,000	171,303,000	293,949,000	214,882,000	-119,750,000	+43,579,000	-79,067,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,794,375,000)	(1,426,700,000)	(2,522,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(+493,700,000)	(+861,375,000)	(-234,000,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(177,045,000)	(129,800,000)	(182,045,000)	(185,451,000)	(+8,406,000)	(+55,651,000)	(+3,406,000)
Total, title III, Rural Development Programs:							
New budget (obligational) authority	12,144,641,000	2,424,607,000	2,988,535,000	2,715,692,000	-9,428,949,000	+291,085,000	-272,843,000
(Loan authorization)	(9,722,056,000)	(7,470,750,000)	(10,845,756,000)	(8,403,256,000)	(-1,318,800,000)	(+932,506,000)	(-2,442,500,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(187,045,000)	(129,800,000)	(182,045,000)	(185,451,000)	(-1,594,000)	(+55,651,000)	(+3,406,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS							
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services	485,000	574,000	542,000	522,000	+37,000	-52,000	-20,000
Food and Nutrition Service:							
Child nutrition programs	880,698,000	1,389,711,000	1,392,294,000	1,393,651,000	+512,953,000	+3,940,000	+1,357,000
Transfer from section 32	4,696,501,000	4,675,092,000	4,675,092,000	4,675,092,000	-21,409,000	---	---
Total, Child nutrition programs	5,577,199,000	6,064,803,000	6,067,386,000	6,068,743,000	+491,544,000	+3,940,000	+1,357,000
Special milk program	19,268,000	23,011,000	23,011,000	23,011,000	+3,743,000	---	---
Special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	2,350,000,000	2,573,400,000	2,600,000,000	2,573,400,000	+223,400,000	---	-26,600,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Commodity supplemental food program	81,928,000	85,369,000	91,284,000	88,318,000	+6,390,000	+2,949,000	-2,966,000
Food stamp program:							
Expenses	17,453,168,000	19,649,975,000	19,649,975,000	19,649,975,000	+2,196,807,000	---	---
Subject to budget request	2,123,513,000	2,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	3,000,000,000	+876,487,000	+500,000,000	+1,500,000,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	974,220,000	1,013,000,000	1,002,175,000	1,013,000,000	+38,780,000	---	+10,825,000
Cattle tick eradication	---	---	10,825,000	---	---	---	-10,825,000
Total, Food stamp program	20,550,901,000	23,162,975,000	22,162,975,000	23,662,975,000	+3,112,074,000	+500,000,000	+1,500,000,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:							
Needy family program	78,241,000	81,527,000	81,945,000	82,108,000	+3,867,000	+581,000	+163,000
Elderly feeding program	149,897,000	151,492,000	151,492,000	143,035,000	-6,862,000	-8,457,000	-8,457,000
Subtotal	228,138,000	233,019,000	233,437,000	225,143,000	-2,995,000	-7,876,000	-8,294,000
Soup kitchens	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	---	---	---
Total, Food donations programs	260,138,000	265,019,000	265,437,000	257,143,000	-2,995,000	-7,876,000	-8,294,000
The emergency food assistance program	50,000,000	27,000,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	-5,000,000	+18,000,000	-5,000,000
Commodity purchases - TEFAP	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	---	---	---
Total, The emergency food assistance program	170,000,000	147,000,000	170,000,000	165,000,000	-5,000,000	+18,000,000	-5,000,000
Food program administration	96,778,000	113,856,000	101,617,000	105,453,000	+8,675,000	-8,403,000	+3,836,000
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	29,106,212,000	32,435,433,000	31,481,710,000	32,944,043,000	+3,837,831,000	+508,610,000	+1,462,333,000
Human Nutrition Information Service	9,923,000	12,654,000	11,255,000	9,788,000	-135,000	-2,866,000	-1,467,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs, new budget (obligational) authority	29,116,620,000	32,448,661,000	31,493,507,000	32,954,353,000	+3,837,733,000	+505,692,000	+1,460,846,000

TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Foreign Agricultural Service	105,048,000	109,523,000	110,023,000	106,626,000	+1,578,000	-2,897,000	-3,397,000
Ameri Flora '92 Exposition	500,000	---	500,000	---	-500,000	---	-500,000
Public Law 480:							
Title I - Credit sales:							
Program level	(880,000,000)	(463,800,000)	(570,800,000)	(563,804,000)	(-316,196,000)	(+100,004,000)	(-6,996,000)
Direct loans	(806,400,000)	(417,420,000)	(513,800,000)	(511,619,000)	(-294,781,000)	(+94,199,000)	(-2,181,000)
Ocean freight differential	(73,600,000)	---	---	---	(-73,600,000)	---	---
Appropriation	314,853,000	---	---	---	-314,853,000	---	---
Ocean freight differential	---	46,380,000	57,000,000	52,185,000	+52,185,000	+5,805,000	-4,815,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:							
Program level	(696,000,000)	(627,000,000)	(696,000,000)	(710,087,000)	(+14,087,000)	(+83,087,000)	(+14,087,000)
Appropriation	696,000,000	627,000,000	696,000,000	710,087,000	+14,087,000	+83,087,000	+14,087,000
Title III - Commodity grants:							
Program level	---	(309,200,000)	(254,959,000)	(333,609,000)	(+333,609,000)	(+24,409,000)	(+78,650,000)
Appropriation	---	309,200,000	254,959,000	333,609,000	+333,609,000	+24,409,000	+78,650,000
Loan subsidies	---	316,826,000	389,979,000	388,319,000	+388,319,000	+71,493,000	-1,660,000
Debt restructuring	---	668,000	668,000	---	---	-668,000	-668,000
Salaries and expenses:							
General Sales Manager	---	1,274,000	1,274,000	1,242,000	+1,242,000	-32,000	-32,000
ASCS	---	573,000	705,000	558,000	+558,000	-15,000	-147,000
Subtotal	---	1,847,000	1,979,000	1,800,000	+1,800,000	-47,000	-179,000
Total, Public Law 480:							
Program level	(1,576,000,000)	(1,400,000,000)	(1,521,759,000)	(1,607,500,000)	(+31,500,000)	(+207,500,000)	(+85,741,000)
Appropriation	1,010,853,000	1,301,921,000	1,400,585,000	1,486,000,000	+475,147,000	+184,079,000	+85,415,000
CCC Export Loans:							
Loan guarantees:							
Short-term export credit	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	---	---	---
Intermediate export credit	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	---	---	---
Emerging democracies export credit	---	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(+200,000,000)	---	---
Loan subsidy	---	155,524,000	155,524,000	155,524,000	+155,524,000	---	---
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):							
General Sales Manager	---	2,731,000	2,731,000	1,876,000	+1,876,000	-855,000	-855,000
ASCS	---	589,000	589,000	589,000	+589,000	---	---
Subtotal	---	158,844,000	158,844,000	157,989,000	+157,989,000	-855,000	-855,000
Office of International Cooperation and Development	6,879,000	6,672,000	7,392,000	7,247,000	+368,000	+575,000	-145,000
Scientific activities overseas (foreign currency program)	1,062,000	---	1,062,000	---	-1,062,000	---	-1,062,000
Total, title V, International Programs, new budget (obligational) authority	1,124,342,000	1,576,960,000	1,678,406,000	1,757,862,000	+633,520,000	+180,902,000	+79,456,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or –)		
					1991 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION							
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES							
Food and Drug Administration							
Salaries and expenses	656,519,000	537,104,000	725,962,000	704,734,000	+48,215,000	+167,630,000	-21,228,000
Buildings and facilities	8,350,000	10,000,000	10,350,000	8,350,000	---	-1,650,000	-2,000,000
Rental payments	25,612,000	25,612,000	25,612,000	25,612,000	---	---	---
Total, Food and Drug Administration	690,481,000	572,716,000	761,924,000	738,696,000	+48,215,000	+165,980,000	-23,228,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY							
Financial Management Service: Payments to the farm credit system financial assistance corporation	90,000,000	112,606,000	112,606,000	112,606,000	+22,606,000	---	---
Farm Credit System Assistance Board (limitation on administrative expenses)	(2,017,000)	(2,175,000)	(2,175,000)	(2,175,000)	(+158,000)	---	---
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	43,960,000	48,285,000	47,300,000	46,597,000	+2,637,000	-1,688,000	-703,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,898,000)	(43,276,000)	(40,290,000)	(40,290,000)	(-608,000)	(-2,986,000)	---
Total, title VI, Related Agencies: New budget (obligational) authority	824,441,000	733,607,000	921,830,000	897,899,000	+73,458,000	+164,292,000	-23,931,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(42,915,000)	(45,451,000)	(42,465,000)	(42,465,000)	(-450,000)	(-2,986,000)	---

RECAPITULATION

Grand Total:							
New budget (obligational) authority.....	54,089,588,000	52,579,946,000	52,570,051,000	53,120,030,000	-969,558,000	+540,084,000	+549,979,000
(By transfer).....	(638,302,000)	(774,834,000)	(5,098,000)	(724,387,000)	(+86,085,000)	(-50,447,000)	(+719,289,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(15,222,056,000)	(13,170,750,000)	(16,545,756,000)	(14,103,256,000)	(-1,118,800,000)	(+932,506,000)	(-2,442,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(120,241,000)	(140,362,000)	(137,583,000)	(133,376,000)	(+13,135,000)	(-6,986,000)	(-4,207,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(187,045,000)	(129,800,000)	(182,045,000)	(185,451,000)	(-1,594,000)	(+55,651,000)	(+3,406,000)
Title I - Agricultural programs.....	8,551,840,000	12,598,510,000	12,740,716,000	12,003,205,000	+3,451,365,000	-595,305,000	-737,511,000
Title II - Conservaton programs.....	2,327,704,000	2,797,601,000	2,747,057,000	2,791,019,000	+463,315,000	-6,582,000	+43,962,000
Title III - Farmers Home and Rural development programs.....	12,144,641,000	2,424,607,000	2,988,535,000	2,715,692,000	-9,428,949,000	+291,085,000	-272,843,000
Title IV - Domestic food programs.....	29,116,620,000	32,448,661,000	31,493,507,000	32,954,353,000	+3,837,733,000	+505,692,000	+1,460,846,000
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs.....	1,124,342,000	1,576,960,000	1,678,406,000	1,757,862,000	+633,520,000	+180,902,000	+79,456,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	824,441,000	733,607,000	921,830,000	897,899,000	+73,458,000	+164,292,000	-23,931,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	54,089,588,000	52,579,946,000	52,570,051,000	53,120,030,000	-969,558,000	+540,084,000	+549,979,000
Memoranda:							
Direct and insured loan level.....	5,129,536,000	2,729,050,000	5,200,826,000	5,111,326,000	-18,210,000	+2,382,276,000	-89,500,000
Guaranteed loan level.....	4,390,620,000	3,038,800,000	4,385,620,000	3,054,026,000	-1,336,594,000	+15,226,000	-1,331,594,000
Transfers from Commodity Credit Corporation.	630,406,000	769,736,000	---	719,289,000	+88,883,000	-50,447,000	+719,289,000